

Declassified Authority:
38037
By: MKS Date: 03-12-2018

Screened By: MKS
Date: 03-12-2018
DOCID: 32698860
FOIA Case: 38037

100-7926-34

100-7826-34

~~SECRET~~
This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the espionage laws, U.S.C. 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

COPY
84

FOREIGN NATIONALITY GROUPS IN THE UNITED STATES
MEMORANDUM BY THE FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH
TO THE DIRECTOR OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

NUMBER 181 7 APRIL 1944

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES ASSESS
THE SOVIET AUTONOMY MOVE

A survey of the views of important foreign-nationality spokesmen and press organs indicates that the Soviet Union's constitutional grant of autonomy to its constituent republics is likely to prove a powerful lever of influence throughout Central and Southeastern Europe. Assailed by groups fearing Soviet domination and welcomed by those whose brothers in the homeland look to the powerful eastern neighbor for liberation, the enigmatic step has already resulted in one major and several minor realignments among foreign-nationality factions in the United States.

The recently announced change in the Soviet constitution, granting future military and diplomatic autonomy to the sixteen constituent republics comprising the USSR, was generally regarded by the foreign-nationalities groups in the United States as both strengthening and extending Soviet influence in Central and Southeastern Europe. Opponents of such influence professed to see a deliberate design, undermining the unity of the associated powers and boding ill for the future. Groups and individuals favoring it, on the other hand, considered an extension of Soviet influence in that area not only natural but a boon to the Slavic peoples and a bulwark for the peace of Europe.

The announcement was not confined in its effects to expressions of satisfaction or alarm. There were signs at once of realignments among certain of the foreign-nationality communities, particularly when taken in conjunction with the swift advance into Central and Southeastern Europe of the Red Army. Most notable perhaps, was the unanimity with which Armenian-Americans — including even the hitherto bitterly anti-Soviet Armenian Revolutionary Federation of America, American branch of Tashnag—greeted what apparently seemed a long-awaited opportunity to achieve Armenian statehood, including severance of last ties with Turkey.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 181

— 2 —

7 APRIL 1944

The Carpatho-Russian-American community, approximately ninety per cent of which is believed committed already to seeing the former easternmost province of Czechoslovakia incorporated in the Soviet Union, was strengthened in its stand by the constitutional change. Among Czechoslovak-Americans, the pro-Benes wing which includes most Czechs, expressed pleasure or unconcern; but Slovak-Americans were sharply divided, some interpreting the change as providing support for their drive for autonomy, others fearing that whatever autonomy was now achieved would be strictly of the Soviet variety. Yugoslav-Americans of the Partisan persuasion could have been expected to hail the change as laying the spectre of a Communist-dominated Yugoslavia; and most of them did.

Polish- and Baltic-American hostility to everything Muscovite received an anticipated boost from the autonomy announcement, one Polish-American spokesman even going so far as to foresee a resulting split between the Anglo-American powers and the USSR from which Poland could be expected to gain. Ukrainian-American nationalists were equally convinced of the "hypocrisy" of the step, but some of them appeared to derive satisfaction from what they took to be a rebuff to Poland whose Ukrainian-speaking population, it was said, would now fall within the jurisdiction of the Ukrainian SSR. German- and Hungarian-American papers, for the most part, were extremely guarded in their comment, preferring to emphasize the idea of a Soviet counterweight to Field Marshal Smuts' proposed British Empire "big stick."

Few foreign-language newspapers or spokesmen in the United States interpreted the constitutional change as a purely internal move on the part of the USSR. Some, in fact, regarded it as so patent a harbinger of aggressive Russian action as to call for immediate American countersteps. Michael War-govich, chairman *ex officio* of the Council of American Slovak Organizations and Newspapers, for example, told a member of this Branch that in his opinion the United States Government should invest a substantial sum of money in a vigorous campaign to unite Poles, Slovaks, Serbs, Croats, Hungarians, and others behind an "American plan" federation of Central and Southeastern Europe as a defensive bloc against Soviet aspirations.

Armenian-
Americans
Unanimous

Without exception Armenian-language papers and the leaders of the three Armenian-American political parties, which number roughly 1,000 members each, greeted the announcement of the Soviet autonomy reform with enthusiasm. As far as the Communist-line Armenian Progressive League of America and

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 181

— 3 —

7 APRIL 1944

the generally pro-Soviet Armenian Democratic Liberal Union were concerned, this was to be expected. What was unexpected was that the grant would be hailed with fervor by the usually violently anti-Soviet Armenian Revolutionary Federation of America, the American branch of the Tashnag Party. In a series of editorials the Tashnag organ *Hairenik* called the grant "one of the most significant achievements in the cause of human freedom," welcomed the prospect of having an Armenian ambassador in Washington, and offered Tashnag support for the transfer of Armenian irredenta from Turkey to the Soviet Armenian Republic.

James G. Mandalian—editor of *Hairenik* and reputed spokesman for the first Prime Minister of Independent Armenia, Simon Vratzian, now residing in Boston—stated frankly to a member of this Branch that the decentralization scheme changed his party's attitude towards the Soviets; Tashnag would be "happy to cooperate" from now on because its program of "true socialism, true nationalism" including the recovery of Turkish Armenia, was now within the realm of achievement.

Yerant Messian, until recently editor of *Baikar*, organ of the Armenian Democratic Liberal Union, expressed his party's delight at the "vistas" opened by the autonomy grant and the "brilliant work" of Armenian generals and soldiers in Russia. Messian stated that many Armenian-Americans are now showing an interest in Armenian affairs for the first time and that an influx of expatriates from all over the world into the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic can be expected after the war. This Republic, said *Baikar* itself on 3 February, would never withdraw from the Soviet "family" to which it owes its preservation and advancement.

Lraper, organ of the pro-Communist Armenian Progressive League of America, welcomed the "Resounding News" in an editorial 5 February but took occasion to denounce the ultra-nationalist Tashnags and their leader Vratzian as "quislings" to the Armenian cause.

Carpatho-Russian-Americans Concur

Likewise uniformly enthusiastic was the Carpatho-Russian-American community, a large majority of which has for some time openly demanded incorporation of the Czechoslovak province of Sub-Carpathian-Russia within the USSR. The Russian Orthodox religious weekly *Svit* and *Pravda*, mouthpiece of the League for the Liberation of All Russians in Galicia and Carpatho-Russia were not far behind the Communist-line *Karpatska Rus* in

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 181

— 4 —

7 APRIL 1944

greeting the autonomy move as a "thoroughly democratic measure" and "one of the great political achievements of our century." The Carpatho-Russians for one, said the Reverend Stephen Varzaly, editor of the weekly *Vistnik* and one of the leaders of the Carpatho-Russian Greek Catholic Orthodox Church of the Eastern Rite, "have more faith in this [Soviet] example than they do in that of the Czechoslovak Republic." Though more reserved in his comment, John P. Sekerak, president of the Greek Catholic Union of the United States, who has recently taken a stand for Carpatho-Russia's union with Russia linked the Soviet move with the dissolution of the Comintern and with the new recognition accorded of the Orthodox Church as honest progress toward democracy.

Almost the sole dissenting voice in the Carpatho-Russian-American chorus of approval was provided by the leader of the small pro-Benes group, Gregory Zatkovich, one-time governor of Sub-Carpathian Russia under the Czechoslovak Republic. Despite official Czechoslovak assurances that Russia definitely guaranteed Czechoslovakia's pre-war frontiers, Zatkovich expressed the fear that the inhabitants of Sub-Carpathian-Russia would be attracted by the Soviet autonomy provisions and induced to vote for the incorporation of their territory into the Soviet Union once it is occupied by the Red Army. In contrast to this view the Reverend Ivan Ladizinsky, another prominent member of the small group of pro-Czech Carpatho-Russian-Americans, though heretofore steadfastly maintaining that Czechoslovakia would and should remain separate and independent from the USSR, now welcomed Czechoslovakia's chance to join a Soviet Commonwealth of Nations.

*Ukrainian-American
Uneasiness*

In the Ukrainian-American community the Catholic nationalist *Ameryka* denounced the autonomy grant on the grounds that it leaves economic control in Moscow's hands, while the independent but unpredictable *Ukrainska Nova Pora* called it a bluff and a trick to pack the peace conference "with 16 Soviet quislings." In the ultra-nationalist *Svoboda* the redoubtable Professor Chubaty, champion of full Ukrainian independence, likened the reform to the gift of a top-hat to a barefoot gentleman, maintaining that the Ukrainians would prefer "true cultural and economic autonomy first." But the Pittsburgh *Narodne Slovo*, which usually follows in *Svoboda's* footsteps, preferred to emphasize the expected discomfit of the Poles; the new constitutional change, the paper asserted, recognizing national differences and giving different peoples the right to rule themselves ("which is much more than the

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 181

— 5 —

7 APRIL 1944

Treaty of Versailles ever did”), fell “upon the Polish landlords in London” like a blockbuster.

The liberal and at present pro-Russian *Hromadsky Holos* noted the immediate implementation of the reform through the appointment of Alexander Korneichuk as Foreign Minister of the Ukrainian SSR and held that especially the people of the Ukraine, where opposition to the Kremlin’s concentration of power was strongest, would find the grant “a source of inspiration in their future activities.” The Communist-line *Ukrainski Shchodenni Visty* rejoiced that the reform would disarm diehard Ukrainian-American nationalists of their favorite argument about the Soviet Ukraine’s rightlessness.

Most Russian-Americans Approve Russian-Americans, by and large, appeared to welcome the Soviet constitutional change. Not only the pro-Communist *Russky Golos* but the liberal *Novaya Zarya*, the liberal, once anti-Soviet *Novoye Russkoye Slovo* and the Social-Democratic monthly *Novyi Put*, came out with glowing tributes to the Soviet reform as a victory for the Russian people. *Novoye Russkoye Slovo*, one of the most widely read Russian-language dailies, complained that Russia is distrusted not because it is Soviet, but because it is strong. *Novyi Put* saw in the move not only the reflection of a growing trend toward internal democratization but a step which would put an end to insinuations of Soviet imperialism, freeing Finland, Poland, and the Baltic States from their fears of losing national identity.

Only two notes of discord could be detected in the symphony of praise. The violently anti-Soviet daily *Rossiia*, which caters to formerly Czarist circles among the Russian-Americans, raged at the change as high treason to the Russian people, the liquidation of Russian patriotism, and “the last step in the process of disintegration of Russia.” From the opposite corner of Russian political sentiment in America came condemnation of a different sort. Domestically, said *Socialistichesky Vestnik*, organ of the Abramovich faction of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party (Menshevik), the change changes nothing. “The absolute iron-handed domination of the monopolist Communist Party” remains in full force, while in the foreign field the USSR is preparing to surround itself with a chain of semi-vassal states. Of two alternatives before the world, a resolution of this party’s Executive Committee warned, Russia is abandoning collective security, the first, in favor of spheres of influence and the suppression of small nations, the second. Consequently, the resolution con-

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 181

— 6 —

7 APRIL 1944

cluded, although the party for which the Committee speaks had suspended its opposition to the Soviet Government so long as Russia was in grave peril, it would no longer pass-up in silence the dangerous trend of Soviet policy.

*American Polonia
Leads the Attack*

Topping the list of foreign nationalities vehemently denouncing the Soviet reform were the Polish-Americans. So overwhelming was American Polonia's disapproval of this move that a mere enumeration of the sentiments expressed from the Right through most of the Left would constitute no more than reiteration of the same negative designations: "trickery," "slick maneuver," "Bolshevik comedy," etc.

Professor Clement Jedrzejewski, a consultant of The Polish Consulate General in New York, saw serious trouble developing between Russia and her Western Allies as a result of the step but thought that the Polish people in this widening gap "may find their own salvation." "With the Federated Russian SSR representing nine-tenths of the population as compared with the other republics," said Karol Piatkiewicz, editor-in-chief of the publications of the Polish National Alliance, to a member of this Branch, "it is easy enough to see which will have the most say and whose weight will carry most." The Detroit KNAPPist daily *Dziennik Polski* saw immediate proof of the "hypocrisy" of the diplomatic autonomy move in the Ukraine's "asking Stalin's help" in its demand for territory west of the Curzon line.

That these views were not limited to Polish-American Rightist and Catholic circles can be seen in the estimates of the Toledo weekly *Ameryka Echo*, organ of the strongly anti-Catholic Polish National Church, and of the New York weekly *Robotnik Polski*, organ of the Polish Socialist Alliance. The Communist party dictatorship over military and foreign affairs, these publications asserted, remains what it was and "the Soviet autonomous republics will be marionettes dancing at the order of Moscow." Even the New Bedford *Trybuna*, ordinarily friendly to the USSR, thought that although the grant might be construed as an act of reward for the Soviet peoples, it may contain "other motives and hidden aims." With virtually the one exception of the pro-Communist weekly *Glos Ludowy*, in short, none of the numerous Polish-American publications saw any good-for Poland in the Soviet reform.

*Baltic-American
Disapproval*

Echoing the views of the Poles, and joined in its suspicion by the bulk of Finnish-, Latvian-, and Estonian-American papers, the Lithuanian-American press employed such epithets to describe the Soviet grant as "smokescreen,"

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 181

— 7 —

7 APRIL 1944

"fake" and a play on words." Thanks for the generosity, declared in effect the Lithuanian-language nationalist papers *Amerika* and *Sandara*, but Lithuania does not need such gifts — she has her army, her flag, and diplomatic representation abroad. With equal emphasis, the Socialist *Naujienos*, the pro-Smetona *Vienybe*, the Catholic anti-Smetonist *Lieutuviu Zinios*, and the largest Catholic Lithuanian-language paper in America *Draugas*, branded the autonomy move as a snare intended primarily for the Baltic States and declared it would bring slavery in its wake.

In speeches before a New York convention of Americans of Lithuanian Descent (6 February) and at a Baltimore anniversary celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day (16 February) the Lithuanian Minister to the United States, Povilas Zadeikis, called the autonomy change "a solely Russian policy which has nothing in common with the fundamental rights and aspirations of the Lithuanian nation." "No power in the world," he concluded one speech defiantly, "will take away our right to be an independent nation." Zadeikis's sentiments were reiterated in many cities by a host of leaders constituting a veritable *Who's Who* of Lithuania in America. Though in somewhat more guarded language, the Finnish-American community accorded the Soviet change a similar reception in its press.

As in the case of the Poles, a few expected exceptions to this total picture of negation could be noted. In a recent talk with a representative of this Branch, Father Norbert Pakalnis, rector of the Church of the Annunciation in Brooklyn and one of the leaders of Lithuanian Catholics, made the sweeping statement that a number of Lithuanian priests have privately agreed with him that were Soviet Russia to go so far as to grant freedom to other churches besides the Greek Orthodox; they "would be wholly in favor of Communism." Also, at a meeting of the Lithuanian American Council of Greater New York on 13 February, Jonas Januskis, former editor of the recently liquidated Socialist weekly *Naujoje Gadyne*, who stated that he officially represented the Lithuanian Socialist Federation, took the equivocal position that though past Soviet behavior did not leave much ground for optimism no one could foretell what Soviet occupation of Lithuania would bring, and that if the autonomy grant to the Lithuanian people should prove genuine there would be some hope for the future.

As could be anticipated, unequivocal affirmation of the Soviet change was expressed by the Communist-line papers, the Finnish-American *Tyomies* and

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 181

— 8 —

7 APRIL 1944

Eteenpain and the Lithuanian-American *Laisve* and *Vilnis*. Taking particular note of the 2 February speech of Justas Paleckis, Praesidium Chairman of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, which stressed the fact that almost a third of the Lithuanian people reside in America and "have always maintained a close relationship with their land of birth," *Laisve* and *Vilnis* played up the expectation that a Soviet Lithuanian ambassador would be installed in Washington and that Lithuanian-Americans would then be able to visit their relatives in the homeland.

Italian-American Hostility While several Italian-language papers, such as the republican *Italia Libera* and the once pro-Fascist *Progresso Italo-Americano*, couched their estimates in objective terms, stating that Russia is out to allay the anxiety of the small European states, and that she knows what she wants and is keeping pace politically with her military victories, the great majority of Italian-American papers displayed distinct hostility to the Soviet change. From the Socialist *Parola* and the tiny anarchist *Adunata dei Refrattari* on the Left to the large group of once pro-Fascist papers and the Catholic publications on the Right, it was variously agreed that Russia was seeking to draw the European peoples into her orbit, that she had not given up the final goal of world empire, and that the Comintern which went out the door was coming back through the window.

A middle position cautioning against premature fear was taken by Don Luigi Sturzo, the venerable former leader of the Catholic Popular Party, now residing in America. If, said he, the Soviet republics should obtain political liberty along with diplomatic and military autonomy, then both Russia and the world would be the better off for it.

Divided Opinion: the Rumanian-Americans Attesting to uncertainty in the Rumanian-American community and to the precarious position of their homeland, an uneasy Axis satellite already partly occupied by Soviet armies, two former Rumanian diplomats now resident in the United States, E. C. Teodorescu and Charles A. Davila, expressed divergent views. Teodorescu called the grant "gilding the gingerbread" of Sovietization, and charged that it will neither cause Rumania to sue for peace nor induce her to join the Soviet Union. Davila, an old advocate of Russian-Rumanian rapprochement, thought that Russia was offering far-sighted proof of the solvability of Europe's problems; after revamping her

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 181

— 9 —

7 APRIL 1944

government, Rumania could become a part of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic and thereafter freely leave if she found it desirable to do so.

America, the largest Rumanian-American paper and a supporter of the Rumanian-American Alliance for Democracy, of which Davila is honorary president, carried a succinct account of reactions in London and Washington without editorial comment. Rumanian-American religious opinion continued to voice uneasiness about the Kremlin's intentions. The Communist-line *Romanul American*, as was to be expected, acclaimed the constitutional reform as a vehicle for better Soviet relations with neighbor states.

*Czech and Slovak
Differences Sharpened*

With notable unanimity Czech-language papers in America greeted the Soviet change as a democratic measure destined to aid European peace and security. The same view was taken by the Communist-line papers, the Czech-language *Nova Doba* and Slovak-American *L'udovy Dennik*. Joseph Martinek, executive secretary of the Czechoslovak National Council and president of the newly formed Alliance of Czech Journalists in America, epitomized these views when he called the step extra insurance against a future "*cordon sanitaire* hostile to the Soviets." Dr. Jan Papanek, director of the Czechoslovak Information Center in New York, told a member of this Branch that the change had been initiated more for domestic than for foreign-political reasons.

The Slovak community as a whole presented a complex of attitudes. The non-sectarian *Narodne Noviny*, organ of the National Slovak Society which has vacillated between support of former Prime Minister Milan Hodza's program for an autonomous Slovakia within a restored Czechoslovakia and the Slovak League's demands for an independent Slovakia, hailed the grant as giving meaning to the Atlantic Charter and pointing the way for the solution of nationality problems. The violently Czechophobe *Slovak v Amerike*, on the other hand, concluded ironically that Slovaks should interest themselves in the change because as soon as Russia seizes Central Europe "Slovakia will surely be one of the hopeful Soviet Republics, guided and governed by the new Soviet constitution." Most of the Catholic Slovak-language papers uttered pointed warnings against this new sign of Communist intentions.

The split was best illustrated, perhaps, in the reactions of a number of Slovak leaders. Emil Stankoviansky, editor of *Slovensky Hlasnik*, organ of the Slovak Evangelical Union; Wendell Platek, president of the National Slovak

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 181

— 10 —

7 APRIL 1944

Society; Michael Wargovich, president of the First Catholic Slovak Union; and Paul Jamriska, vice president of the Slovak League of America, all despite their differences shared the view that Slovakia's fate was in the hands of the Soviets and that willingly or otherwise Benes was executing Stalin's will. But whereas Stankoviansky, observing that Great Britain was not in a strategic position to defend the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe, embraced the Soviet change with the statement that "Slovak autonomy is more likely to be gained under the USSR than under any Republic," and whereas Platek gave no indication of anxiety at such prospect, perhaps because he continues to believe that Russia might recognize Czechoslovakia's former frontiers, Wargovich bitterly protested the move as prologue to a scheme for a separate Czechia, a separate Carpatho-Russia and a separate Slovakia to be embodied in a Soviet federation. Jamriska also eyed the grant with great distrust.

Dr. Hodza shared the forebodings of both Jamriska and Wargovich: Benes by adopting since his return from Moscow a conciliatory attitude on the question of a decentralized Czechoslovakia, was stealing his (Hodza's) thunder. Associating this metamorphosis with the Soviet autonomy move and with Benes's recent call for the creation of "committees" in the homeland, Hodza expressed to a member of this Branch grave apprehension that Czechoslovakia was being led by its President into the USSR.*

Yugoslav-Americans The Yugoslav-American reaction closely paralleled the Czechoslovak one. Serb-, Croatian-, and Slovenian-American groups already partial to the pro-Soviet Partisan cause approved the step. Ivan Subasich, former governor of Croatia and since his resignation from the Government-in-Exile a moderate adherent of Marshal Tito, stressed that whatever the ultimate effects on Croatia and Slovenia, the diplomatic and military autonomy features of the Soviet reform would exercise a strong power of attraction.

The Slovenian Socialist publications *Glas Naroda* and *Prosveta* appeared to be impressed. But the Slovenian clerical *Ameriska Domovina* and the ultra-chauvinist *Amerikanski Srbobran*, organ of the Serb National Federation, saw in the change a thinly disguised maneuver to attract small states into the web of Soviet supremacy. Russia, said Branko Pekich, a secretary of the Federation, wants 16 votes and is out to dominate "all states, all nations, the world." Russia,

*For a detailed exposition of Dr. Hodza's views on this subject see FN Number B-182 of 7 April 1944.

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 181

— 11 —

7 APRIL 1944

countered Mark Vinski, secretary of the National Council of Americans of Croatian Descent, had already shown her good intentions "by stepping out of Sinkiang."

*German- and
Hungarian-Americans*

That most German- and Hungarian-Americans, in view of the belligerent status of their homelands, would be guarded in their comment on the Soviet move was to be expected. The majority of German-

American papers dwelt little on the possible effects the constitutional change might have on the fate of Germany, evaluating the announcement largely in terms of a contest between Great Britain and the USSR. Some, like the pro-German Milwaukee *Deutsche Zeitung*, discussed the change in terms of the fifteen additional votes Soviet Russia would presumably be able to wield. Most of the others, like the liberal *Waechter und Anzeiger*, the formerly pro-German *New Yorker Staats-Zeitung und Herold*, the clerical *St. Joseph's Blatt* and the Communist-inclined German-Jewish *Aufbau*, considered the change a Russian answer to Field Marshal Smuts' speech on the future of the British Empire and carried lengthy expositions on relative spheres in the emerging balance of power.

One exception to these circumspect approaches to the question was the Social Democratic *Neue Volkszeitung's* editorial of 5 February which described the grant as preparation for Soviet inclusion of new member republics, ultimately perhaps even of Germany, and concluded that the chances for a democratic Europe were becoming increasingly gloomy. The German people, shouted Otto Brauer former Social-Democratic Mayor of Altona, at a New York Town Hall meeting on 15 February, will not accept a mere change "from the swastika to the Soviet flag."

The once pro-Nazi *Detroit Abendpost* on the other hand, thought that "even to a great part of the German people, the federation as suggested by Stalin will appear to be far more bearable than Hitler's iron fist." And the habitually anti-Russian Chicago *Abendpost* approvingly interpreted the grant as a "statesmanlike and grandiose" Pan-Slav move which would end the multiplicity of troublesome little states in the Balkans and Eastern Europe.

In its greater part the Hungarian-American press likewise reacted cautiously without particular reference to Hungary's fate, despite that country's proximity to the onrushing Red armies. *Amerikai Magyar Nepszava*, organ of the American Hungarian Federation, held that Stalin was engaging in the

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 181

— 12 —

7 APRIL 1944

same maneuver for the Soviet Union as Smuts and Halifax were for Great Britain and that he was trying to create a League of Nations of his own. The same view was expressed by the liberal *Szabadsag*, and by the IWW paper *Bermunkas*, which described the Soviet move as a fortuitous counter-coup to General Smuts' "encirclement" plan; though the constitutional change might provide a better peace guarantee than a League of Nations, "a new imperialism, more dangerous than any preceding one" was foreseen. Professor Rustem Vambery, chairman of the American Committee for a New Democratic Hungary, also thought that the reform was prompted by fear of the Western Powers; ultimately the voluntary amalgamation of neighboring states with the USSR might be intended.

Off pattern, *Magyar Hirnok*, which usually follows the position of the American Hungarian Federation, quoted as "very simple and very true" the explanation of the Soviet journal *War and the Working Class* that Russia wants neither spheres of influence nor vassal states but friendly neighbors, and is just as blameless for not tolerating an anti-Soviet Poland as the United States is for protesting anti-United Nations policy in the Republic of Argentina, 6,000 miles away.

On the Right the ultra-nationalist clerical *A Jo Pasztor* offered the vote-gain explanation for the Soviet innovation. The pro-Horthy *Wisconsini Magyararsag*, however, thought that Russia was opening a door through which Germany might escape the merciless reprisals anticipated for her.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~
Oss
This document contains information
affecting the national defense of
the United States within the
meaning of the Espionage Act, 50
U.S.C. 31 and 32, as amended. Its
transmission or the revelation of
its contents in any manner to an
unauthorized person is prohibited
by law.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES
FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

11 October 1944

FN Number S-119

MEMORANDUM for the Director of Strategic Services
Secretary of State

SUBJECT: Some Notes on the Russian Community in New York

Among those who fled Bolshevik Russia after 1917 the Czarists were long a subject of much public attention. The anti-Bolshevik Socialists and Social Democrats, mostly intellectuals with very modest material aspirations, have lived on in relative obscurity -- first in Paris and other European capitals and now in the Western Hemisphere.

An interesting remnant survives in New York; some among them begin to think about the possibility of returning to Paris. Their current political positions, with reference particularly to the New Russia, were recently outlined by this Branch in its Number 211 of 13 September 1944, "Russian Nationalism Realigns the Anti-Bolshevik Russians."

The Branch has now received an informal account of a recent visit among the members of the Social Democratic group, which, led by Theodore Dan, has turned pro-Soviet. It was prepared by an American citizen of Russian background who is well known to the Branch as a competent and sympathetic political interpreter. Those who are more

~~SECRET~~

Number S-119

- 2 -

11 October 1944

especially concerned with Russia and with leftist philosophies will find this account (including its final paragraphs which touch upon the new fraternization of "White" with "Red" Russians) of interest as a supplement to our Number 211.

A mimeographed copy of the account is attached.


DeWitt C. Poole

Attachment

~~SECRET~~

September 1944

MY RUSSIAN WEEK IN NEW YORK

The Novy Put Group; My Bias Frankly, I confess a personal fondness for the Novy Put (New Road) people as decent and courageous humans. Also, although disagreeing with some of their political ideas in general and their appraisal of the current situation in Europe in particular, I find their thoughts more original and otherwise noteworthy than those expressed by certain other Russian groups in New York. I say this by way of introduction, in order to warn readers of a possible friendly bias that may find its way into these pages, no matter how hard I try to be truly objective.

Fedor Dan, the Leader It has been said that Fedor Dan is nominally supposed to be the chief of the faction and the editor of its magazine. At this time I wish to correct the statement. Fedor Ilyich Dan, despite his 72 years, is the actual, not nominal, leader of his group. Last week Aron Jugow, his "second in command," said to me of Dan:

"His mind is clear and young. It is wonderful the way he is not afraid to reconsider his previous ideas on the subject of Soviet Russia and come out with his support of what Russia is doing, even though Stalin and his Communists everywhere scorn Dan and all of us. It is no easy matter to do what Dan is doing at his age, both in new thought and actual

~~SECRET~~

labor. He is quick, and his health is better than that of most of us who are younger than he is."

Fedor Dan is a doctor of medicine by training, but no longer practices his profession. He has been in the Russian and international labor and revolutionary movement for the last fifty-five years, in fact since the age of seventeen. He is the sole surviving member of the Iskra (The Spark) group of the Russian Social Democrats once headed by Lenin (the first issue of Iskra was published in December 1900). Mrs. Dan, whom I also met while in New York last week, is a sister of the late Y. Martov, another outstanding member of the Iskra group.

The Dans have been in America since 1940. They live modestly in a small neat apartment in upper Manhattan. Fedor Dan told me:

"For two weeks I work on our magazine, and then the next two weeks I devote to the writing of my book. I follow this with another fortnight of labor on the magazine, and then back to the book."

The Dans are supported by certain American Jewish labor organizations (those that follow Sidney Hillman and oppose David Dubinsky). Since the donation is rather limited, it is regularly supplemented by a wealthy member of the Novy Put group, Simon Liberman, who said to me:

~~SECRET~~

"Altogether the Dans receive about \$125 or \$150 a month. They don't know of my part in this contribution, and that is the way I want it to be. The money, as you see, isn't much, but the Dans have been in political exile or emigration of one kind or another most of their lives -- from Siberia in the 1890's to France up to 1940. They know how to live on limited funds. We are all glad that in these last two years we have given Fedor Ilyich the opportunity to write his book."

Dan's Book Dan's admirers in New York and elsewhere have great faith in his new book. It is almost completed, and steps are now being taken to interest some American publisher in financing its translation and publication.

The tentative title of the volume is The Origins of Bolshevism; the ideas of democracy and socialism in Russia (from the emancipation of the serfs in 1861 to the revolution of 1917). In describing the book to me, Jugow referred to it as "the best work since Plekhanov's unfinished book." He meant G. V. Plekhanov's Istoriya russkoi obshchestvennoi mysli (History of Russian Social Thought), the first volume of which was issued in Moscow in 1914, never to be followed and completed by any further volumes. Jugow hinted to me that Dan in his manuscript has been in fact endeavoring to complete, or fill the gap left by Plekhanov's unfinished work.

When I quoted Jugow's remarks in the course of my

~~SECRET~~

conversation with Dr. Dan, the latter frowned. Clearly, he wanted no such comparisons. He felt his work was unique, and should stand by itself. Dr. Dan gave me a typewritten memorandum as a resume of his book, and this I quote in part, as follows:

The book I am writing is not a political or party pamphlet, but a scientific study. Its task is to investigate the history of the democratic and socialistic ideas in Russia against the background of the processes of economic and social development which the country has gone through, and to attempt by this means to give a scientific explanation for the originality of its political and ideological development.

After the abolition of serfdom in 1861, the economic development of Russia followed the same capitalistic path which the development of Western Europe had embraced considerably earlier. But the political development of Russia became quite different from that of Western Europe. Russia has never known the regime of political democracy which in the 19th century was typical of the capitalistic countries of Western Europe: the political democracy proclaimed by the February revolution of 1917 turned out to be merely a brief transition from Czarist absolutism to Bolshevik dictatorship. The ideological development in Russia was also an original one: individualistic liberalism found few followers there, and Russian democratic thought was from its very birth tied indissolubly to socialistic ideas.

...The theme of my book is not the history of the struggle for democracy in Russia, but the history of Russian democratic thought.

Professor Karpovich on Dan's Book There is no doubt that

~~SECRET~~

Russian intellectuals in America await the publication of Dr. Dan's book with much interest. Even those who are not Social Democrats of Dan's camp try to help with the publication. Professor Michael Karpovich of Harvard University, a right-wing Socialist Revolutionary, wrote this letter to Mr. Billikopf in connection with the latter's efforts to place the book:

I would be very much interested in seeing Mr. Dan's book published. The subject is an important one, and there is virtually nothing on it in English. As a matter of fact, for a number of years I myself have been working intermittently on a book of a somewhat similar nature. But the field is big enough for more than one book on the subject, and my point of view probably would differ from that of Mr. Dan in some substantial respects. Besides, I am not at all sure that I shall ever complete the project as other things have to take precedence in all the time. There can be no doubt as to Mr. Dan's competence in the field. In fact, it would be difficult to find another author as competent as he is to deal with this subject.

The Vestnik Group vs. Dan's Group. But Socialistichesky Vestnik, although officially in the same Social Democratic fold as Dan and his Novy Put followers, does not share the kindly attitude of Karpovich, the Socialist Revolutionary. As you know, the Vestnik people -- R. Abramovitch, Solomon M. Schwarz, David J. Dallin, Boris Nikolayevsky, and others -- are bitterly opposed to the Put group's pro-Soviet attitude. To them, nothing that comes from the pens of Dan and his

~~SECRET~~

followers is good, and it was a sign of a better future for Dan's group and regards the anti-Sovietism of Abramovitch's men with equal scorn. There is now hardly any social intercourse between the two clusters, formerly such staunch friends and close collaborators. Liberman is practically the only one in Dan's entourage who still maintains personal connections of a sort with his Social Democratic opponents. Last Saturday, Liberman mentioned to the Dan's in my presence that he had recently seen Nikolayevsky and that the latter appeared "very much depressed." In his voice, a concise voice Dr. Dan mocked: "And what is he depressed about? Is he depressed by the good news we constantly hear from Europe?" Dr. Dan proceeded to comment on the diplomatic victories of the Soviet Union which, however, he explained by the alleged ineptitudes of the Anglo-American policy in Europe "with its dependence on Badoglio and Bonomi, its attempt to use Mihailovich as a trump card, and its too limited recognition of De Gaulle and new forces in France." As he commented, one gathered the impression that he praised not so much the foreign policy of the Soviet Government as the strength of the popular movement in Europe. He intimated that Stalin's government was successful in beating every diplomatic card of the Anglo-Americans not because of any virtues inherent in the Kremlin but because, according to Dan, the Anglo-

~~SECRET~~

American policy was nearsighted while the Kremlin was smart enough to bank on the popular will of the freed Europeans. Dr. Dan made gentle fun of the expectations of "both the Anglo-Americans and Abramovitch" that there won't be any revolution in Europe, that "everything will settle down" after the war, that at worst, if a revolution does come, it will be "bloodless." He noted: "You and I know that no revolution is bloodless. The most 'bloodless' revolution soon becomes bloody."

He said that even certain American columnists and commentators, such as Walter Lippmann and Dorothy Thompson, have by now "empirically" come to the conclusion which to true socialists was evident years ago -- that World War II is a conflict of ideas more than a clash between nations. Dr. Dan said: "Only Socialistichesky Vestnik and the Anglo-American diplomats don't seem to understand this."

At this point Mrs. Dan came back to the subject of Boris Nikolayevsky's depression. She expressed her opinion, pityingly, that Nikolayevsky is very ill and needs an operation of some kind (as so many Russian emigres in New York, aging men and women that they are, indeed need). Her husband shook his head: "Perhaps. But the whole trouble with Nikolayevsky is that many years ago he met Tsereteli. It was the late Tsereteli who first inspired him with this

~~SECRET~~

extreme conservative Menshevism. Ever since then Nikolayevsky has been implacably and unswervingly anti-Bolshevik. While Abramovitch may at times say, 'on the one hand,' and then, 'but on the other,' Nikolayevsky indulges in no such hesitation, no such weighing of evidence. He is most uncompromising."

The Dans and Liberman then discussed David J. Dallin. Fedor Dan spoke of Dallin disapprovingly, in the following terms: A capable man but with no principles, Dallin will write for the general American public, in English, with a show of dispassionate scholarship. He will occasionally say a few things that seem to be complimentary to the Russians, yet, under the guise of such objective scholarship, he will do enough damage to the Russians. But when writing for his Russian and Jewish readers in New York's special press (Socialistichesky Vestnik, The New Leader, and the like), Dallin goes the whole prejudiced hog, and shows a most unrestrained hatred of the Soviet government, no matter what it does. For instance, in his Yale University Press books, Dallin represents the Nazi-Soviet pact of 1939 as a historic inevitability for the Soviet government, but in his Russian writings he describes the pact as Stalin's crime.

Liberman added to this appraisal his own unflattering

~~SECRET~~

say about Dallin: Recently, in The New Leader, Dallin attacked Vice President Henry A. Wallace for a certain speech delivered by the Vice President during his Siberian trip. The reactionary press of America was only too glad for this attack, and reprinted Dallin's article widely. Liberman telephoned Dallin. To quote Liberman: "I said to Dallin: 'How could you? How could you do such a thing to the only leftist in the highest circles of the American government, you who still call yourself a socialist? You are merely giving munitions to the eager reactionary press which hates you as much as it hates Wallace.' But Dallin was stubborn."

"What did he say?" Dr. Dan was curious.

"He claimed that he was only telling the truth. The truth, don't you know!"

"Ha!" came from Dr. Dan, with dry sarcasm. "The truth must be served! It doesn't matter by whom and for what purpose, ha!"

On another occasion during the past week, Jugow in speaking to me complained about another member of the Abramovitch group, Solomon M. Schwarz, chiefly in connection with a book where both found themselves as two of its three authors. This was Management in Russian Industry and Agriculture, published a few months ago by the Oxford

~~SECRET~~

University Press in New York. The two opponents and their third co-author, Gregory Bienstock, originally agreed (according to what Jugow told me) to give facts and "no political predictions," but Schwarz "went back on his promise" and wrote "a political pamphlet, really," berating the Soviet government. Jugow protested, and Professor Jacob Marschak, the editor of the volume, took Jugow's side. But (says Jugow) Schwarz remained adamant, refusing to change a single line. He raised quite a row, and finally succeeded in having his part of the book printed substantially as written. Jugow complained to me:

"It was too late for me to change much in my part, to make it as political and so join issue with Schwarz. But Marschak tried his best, and explained the difficulty in his introduction to the book, thus making it clear that Schwarz had no right to do what he did. Certainly, it is clear from the introduction and from my part of the book that I am not responsible for Schwarz's abominable views."

Jugow also spoke to me of certain "revolting" articles in the latest issues of Socialistichesky Vestnik. With much indignation he mentioned one article in that magazine wherein the Vestnik's editors "tried to deny credit to the Red Army for its victories. They actually wrote that the Germans were carrying out a long-planned retreat, that the Nazis were

~~SECRET~~

retreating of their own free will -- withdrawing -- and not under any pressure from the Russian armies!"

Jugow likewise grumbled about the ample finances of Socialistichesky Vestnik. "That magazine, and the entire group behind it, gets enough money from Dubinsky's union of garment workers and from the Jewish daily Forward. Abramovitch and all his men obtain all the facilities they need in the Rand School building." (Jugow meant the Socialist Party center on East Fifteenth Street.)

Jugow's Struggle It is true that the Novy Put group, though receiving aid from its own rich member (Liberman) and from the Amalgamated, is less financially secure than the Socialistichesky Vestnik contingent. Dr. Dan, as we have seen, is taken care of, but modestly, and he is perhaps the only one to be given such aid for his living expenses. Jugow, Dan's assistant on the group's magazine, has to work for a living outside the movement, and he works hard.

Until a few months ago, Jugow was employed as an inspector in a war plant, and his job involved physical labor -- that of lifting and moving heavy cases. Suffering from gallstones as he had been for years, he did not improve his health at the war plant. One day he collapsed and had to be taken to a hospital for an operation. On recovery, he changed jobs. He is now, together with his wife, employed by the

~~SECRET~~

United States Government in compiling a Russian-English military dictionary, but the completion of the task is expected by October 15, and Jugow is worried, although not too much, about his future employment. Not too much, because by nature he is an optimist as well as a hard worker. Liberman confirmed my impression when he remarked to me: "Jugow is not a brilliant thinker, but a great researcher, a determined digger of facts and figures. A very able and needed man. I wish somebody would get publishers for his works."

The works, of which Jugow spoke to me hopefully, are in the project stage. Jugow is too busy working for a living to take a few months off to produce his two learned tomes on Russia's economics. One project has to do with post-war trade prospects of the world with specific reference to the Soviet Union. The other deals with the industrialization of Soviet Asia. "I have a solid body of material for either one of the two works," Jugow said to me, "but all I can get from Harper Brothers or the Oxford Press is three or five hundred dollars as an advance against royalties on each volume. This isn't enough, of course, because out of this money I'd have to pay my translator."

Several months ago Jugow applied for a Guggenheim fellowship, but was turned down. For a year or more there was a possibility that the Institute of Pacific

~~SECRET~~

Relations might give Jugow a subsidy of \$3,000 for his study of the industrialization of Soviet Asia, but the Communist element in the Institute succeeded in wrecking these hopes. Last week Jugow told me the sequel: "They gave instead a subsidy to William Mandel, who is a Communist, to write and publish his study on the Soviet Far East. And it turned out to be a slim and weak book." (To this I wish to add my "amen." Slim and weak, indeed.)

Jugow explained to me that his hopes were originally fed by a certain "Professor Normano," a scholar of Russian origin, a rather able man and in recent years sporadically connected either with Harvard or Columbia University, despite his adventurous and somewhat unsavory past in Germany and South America. Sometime ago Normano got hold of a fund left by a German Argentinian philanthropist, at first intended for economic research in Germany, but since the advent of Hitler diverted to the establishment of a more general economic institute in New York. Normano drew into this institute a few professors of Columbia University, but when most of these fell away (apparently frightened by Normano's record as it came to light), Normano and whoever remained with him turned the organization into the "Russian Economic Institute."

Jugow said to me: "Some Columbia professors were still with him, at least nominally, and I as yet didn't know much

~~SECRET~~

against Normano. So, when I was invited, I joined the Russian Economic Institute, and for a while stayed. Normano had grandiose plans for all of us, plans of research, writing, and publication. But Normano also played around with the Communists or their outstanding fellow-travelers, and for a time seemed to be accepted by them as a worthy collaborator. At least in the beginning it appeared that they wouldn't oppose his advocacy of me for the Institute of Pacific Relations to do my study of the industrialization of Soviet Asia. But soon enough they realized that Normano wasn't solid enough for them, that he lacked the recognition and connections in the world of substantial scholarship. And naturally, they were always against me as a Menshevik, even though a pro-Soviet Menshevik. Neither Normano nor anyone better than Normano could prevail upon them to cease their opposition to me. The result was that I failed to get the needed subsidy."

Jugow now keeps away from Normano's Institute. Normano incidentally has some sort of organizational tie with Arthur Upham Pope, the ardent fellow-traveler of the Communists in New York, the author of a recent laudatory biography of Litvinov, and the head of the Iranian Institute and School of Asiatic Studies. On Friday evening September 22, Normano and Pope together staged a dinner-meeting, at which Professor

~~SECRET~~

Robert J. Kerner of the University of California delivered a talk entitled "Soviet Russia in Asia." Normano made a special telephone call to Liberman, inviting him to attend. I was in Liberman's office when the telephone call came. Almost simultaneously a letter arrived soliciting Liberman's attendance at a dinner of the American Russian Institute (Harriet Moore's stamping grounds). Liberman said to me:

"I wonder why these Communists invite me when their attitude toward our whole group is so negative."

I volunteered the explanation:

"Because they want money from you."

Liberman smiled his agreement. He didn't go to the dinner of Harriet Moore's American Russian Institute, nor to the dinner of Normano's Russian Economic Institute but did "slip in" (as he expressed it) to hear the after-dinner talk of Professor Kerner on Friday evening under the Normano-Pope auspices. The next day he told Dr. Dan in my presence:

"Kerner feels exactly like you do, Fedor Ilyich. He believes that Russia will attack Japan when the time comes. It was an able and interesting speech. And like you, Kerner says that not only will the Russian Army influence the West as the result of this war. He says what you and I have been saying -- that the Russian officers and soldiers will in their turn be influenced by the West. They will repeat the

~~SECRET~~

history of the Russian officers of 1813 and 1814 who came back from France and Germany with ideas and desires novel to their country. They will want new liberties in 1945 or '46, and they will want the comforts of the West."

Dr. Dan said hardly anything in reply or confirmation. Perhaps he didn't exactly cherish this comparison of his views with those of Professor Kerner. Perhaps he felt that Liberman didn't express his, Dan's, views precisely enough.

Dan on Postwar Russia and Europe Later Dr. Dan spoke to me of his views briefly, stressing chiefly the Russian influence on Europe.

He remarked that it was a mistake to think, as some commentators are apparently doing, that "Stalin is throwing the revolutionary principle of Russia into a slop pail." Dr. Dan exclaimed: "As if it were a question of what Stalin wants or doesn't want to do!" The revolution (Dan intimated) was not finished or shelved in Russia and Europe. It is now in a new phase, where his, Dan's, brand of modified Menshevism is bound to play a tremendous and revitalizing role. He spoke to me of the early 1900's when the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks were united in a Social Democratic Party. "Then we split. The Bolsheviks

~~SECRET~~

wanted to create socialism without democracy. They proceeded to kill off democracy. We Mensheviks wanted democracy without socialism -- even though we insisted on calling ourselves 'socialists.' All we dreamt about was having our own Russian parliament to which we would come with our briefcases to debate. It was a mistake, of course. But now, after this war, Russia and Europe are going to have both socialism and democracy. The merger is inevitable." ("Sliyaniye neizbezhno.")

Interposing, I said to Dr. Dan:

"You speak of but two forces, socialism and democracy. What about the third force that seems to be very much in the picture -- Russian nationalism?"

Dr. Dan didn't like that. He was short:

"The so-called Russian nationalism of today is different from the usual forms of nationalism. In Soviet Russia it's an expression of spontaneous action of the popular masses."

(He used the Russian words, samodeyatel'nost' narodnykh mass.)

Lieberman's Position From the exchange of views between Dan and Lieberman it was plain to me that Dan is somewhat to the left of Lieberman -- although, curiously enough, during the revolutionary years of 1918-26 it was Dan who declined to collaborate with the Soviet government, and it was

~~SECRET~~

Liberman who worked with Lenin.

Liberman's life is most interestingly told in his autobiography, Dela i Liudi; na sovetsskoi stroike (Affairs and Men; in the Days of Soviet Construction). He wrote it in Russian, and published it at his own expense a few weeks ago (in mid-September) in New York. The publishing house is indicated as New Democracy Books, but in reality it is not a regular publishing concern, but merely a convenient label of Liberman's invention. The address of New Democracy Books, 51 East 42nd Street, is that of Liberman's office in New York from which he manages his lumber and financial interests in this country and Canada.

Also a few weeks ago, practically simultaneously with the appearance of the Russian edition of Dela i Liudi, Liberman signed a contract with the University of Chicago Press for the publication in the spring of 1945 of the English translation of the book, which translation will differ from the Russian original in some details of organization and actual content. Through his considerable connections in France, Liberman is also planning a French translation and edition of the book.

The book tells the story of Liberman's well-packed life; hints at the fortunes he has made and lost as a businessman; but mainly recounts his unique experiences as a moderating

~~SECRET~~

influence and a crypto-Menshevik aide of Lenin in the years of the nationalization of Russia's industries. The concluding chapters give not only the story of Liberman's flight from the wrath of the Cheka in 1926 but also his present-day views on Russia's role in the world at large. The English-language edition will unfold these views in a more extended form, as Liberman has written for it a new epilogue.

The years 1926-44 are hardly touched upon in this book. Liberman is planning a separate book on that phase of his life, and this new narrative will include his role in the Popular Front movement in France and the Spanish civil war of the second half of the 1930's. Suffice it for me to note here that Liberman is now enjoying his fourth or fifth fortune. His first was made between the two revolutions in Russia, 1905-17, during which interim he was a top-rank forestry specialist and manager for Czarist industrialists, grand dukes, and the like. He lost that fortune, rather cheerfully, in 1917-18. The second fortune is rumored to have been made by him in the Soviet era of the New Economic Policy, though this rumor may be untrue or exaggerated. I know from a good friend and business associate of Liberman's that on fleeing the Cheka in 1926 Liberman was actually destitute and in his London and Berlin days of the late 1920's had at times to depend on the bounty of some of his

~~SECRET~~

friends. His next fortune was amassed in the forest concessions of Poland. He lost it later, due to some change in the policy of the Polish Government, but won yet another fortune in other business affairs in Paris and London.

The present money of Liberman comes, it seems, from the business dealings he had with the Spanish Loyalists. It is incorrect to suppose, however, as it is sometimes rumored in New York, that he made this Spanish money in selling munitions. Condensed milk was the commodity which he sold to Spain at a huge and rather unexpected profit, at once reinvested by him in French real estate and various British interests, which further enriched him.

But Liberman is seriously ailing now, and much of his money is either "frozen" in Britain or "marooned" in France. Still, he helps the Novy Put movement financially despite his fear of a destitute old age -- a very real fear with him now, with his memory of all the previous fortunes lost. He knows it is too late for him to make yet another fortune if his present money should go.

Anatole Dubois Among the Novy Put men in New York whom Liberman is helping now, there is that old exile Anatole Dubois, a Menshevik of French-Russian descent, a dapper but not very bright person. Liberman uses him in a

~~SECRET~~

semi-secretarial capacity, dictating his reminiscences to him and comes to his defense when other Russians in New York, particularly non-socialists, make verbal fun of Dubois' well-known naivete.

One recent example of such naivete was Dubois' announcement to Liberman that of all the Communists and fellow-travelers in the Russian colony of New York, ex-General Victor Yakhontoff "is surely the most decent one." Said Dubois: "Yakhontoff told me that he often scolds his friends in the Rusky Golos group for their Communist intolerance. He urges them not to be so intolerant toward other Russians in New York." Dubois declared to Liberman that he, Dubois, believed Yakhontoff. When Liberman quoted this to Lev Kamyshnikov, an old Russian newspaperman in New York of left-liberal and anti-Communist views (formerly connected with Novoye Russkoye Slovo and still occasionally writing for it), Kamyshnikov burst out in indignant laughter and began to tell stories charging Yakhontoff with insincerity, anti-Semitism, treachery, and the like. "How Dubois can be taken in by Yakhontoff is beyond me!" exclaimed Kamyshnikov.

Kamyshnikov also gave vent to his ire as he spoke of Dubois' article on "The Revolution in France" in the 17 September issue of Novy Put: "That fool Dubois speaks of the victory of the French without a single word about the role of the American

~~SECRET~~

and English troops!"

Liberman smiled indulgently, and defended Dubois mildly along the "he-means-well" lines.

As for the celebrated fight of a few months ago between Dubois and Nikolayevsky, all seems to be quiet on that front. The fight appears to be over, a closed incident.

Plans for the Future Now that France is freed, the Novy Put people are earnestly considering the problem of whether or not to return to that country, whence most of them came to the States in 1940 or '41.

There is no agreement on this subject. Liberman and the Dans want to return, for instance, but Jugow does not.

Jugow says: "What, realistically speaking, will I return to or for?" My impression is that both he and his wife are too tired to uproot themselves once more. "Life is hard here for us, no doubt," Jugow said to me, "but we'll always find something to do in America. We won't perish here."

But Dan and his wife simply cannot get used to America. "It's strange, too," Mrs. Dan mused during our conversation on this theme. "It's strange because we have changed so many countries in our long years of exile, and have always gotten used to each new country. But we cannot get used to America. I suppose we are too old."

~~SECRET~~

Liberman wants to return to Western Europe because he hopes to rescue some of his investments in England and France. He also hopes to find his villa near Paris intact. He believes life will be easier for him there than in his present New York apartment.

I doubt if Liberman will continue to be active politically for long after he returns to Europe. He is too ill, really. But Dr. Dan will keep on writing and fighting until the end of his days whether here or in Europe. There is an amazing amount of self-confidence in that old but hale and hearty leader without a mass following.

The Specter of Anti-Semitism The only thing that mars Dr. Dan's self-confidence is the mention of anti-Semitism and of its recent appearance in the Soviet Union.

I watched his energetic face become clouded as first Liberman and then Mrs. Dan described the latest evidences of anti-Semitism in Soviet Russia. Liberman quoted a young American officer of Russian-Jewish descent who had not so long ago returned from a stay in the USSR with disquieting news.

"He told me," related Liberman, "that many Russians have become anti-Semitic; that apparently the Nazi and Rumanian propaganda in the formerly occupied Russian territory has left its pernicious traces. Since it is against Soviet law to refer to Jews as 'Sheenies,' the Russian anti-Semites call them

~~SECRET~~

'Syrians.' One Russian officer said to this American officer: 'We respect all nationalities in the Soviet Union, and they respect us, because all have their own land and are settled; but we don't respect the Jews, or the 'Syrians' as we call them among ourselves, because we see they have no land of their own and aren't settled.' Also," Liberman continued, "the Russians seem to feel that military service at the front is being avoided by the Jews. One Red Army soldier said to this American: 'I was wounded two times, yet a Jewish doctor examines me and sends me to the front again. Himself he sits behind the lines, but I must go. Those Jews!'"

Mrs. Dan confirmed the growth of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, saying that from the letters and travelers' tales reaching her and her husband from Russia they gather that part of the trouble has been caused by the influx of Jews from Polish, Lithuanian, and Bessarabian towns since 1940. Mrs. Dan explained:

"Some Russians feel that their own Jews have been well assimilated, but that these refugees from the West are too Jewish. The refugee Jews speak bad Russian or don't speak it at all and refuse to learn it, sticking to their Yiddish. This has helped the wave of anti-Semitism, among other reasons. But the influence left behind by the Nazis and the Rumanians is also very real. We know that a Jewish doctor, evacuated

~~SECRET~~

in 1941 from Odessa to Archangel, is not allowed to return home because the Soviet authorities recognize the extent of the anti-Semitic feeling in the territories freed from the Nazis and don't let the Jews return there for fear of new trouble. The Soviet authorities feel that this isn't the time to fight anti-Semitism in Russia. They say they'll fight it after the war."

Mrs. Dan also told this story:

"A lady-friend of ours in New York recently received a letter from a woman in Moscow who wrote about a relative:

'He resented the gossip that the Jews stay away from the front, and volunteered to fight. He fell in battle a month ago.'"

The Dans were quite sad as they discussed this new phenomenon in their beloved Russia.

* * *

The Rightists in Russian New York In conclusion I wish to say that, although most of my time in New York was spent with the Novy Put group, I did manage to see Alexander Tarsaidze, a rightist Russian acquaintance of mine (of Georgian origin but imbued with fierce Russian nationalism). He told me the following:

A certain Count Adolberg, a Russian exile whose ancestors

~~SECRET~~

were high up at the Czar's court, particularly at the time of Nicholas I; and who himself served with distinction under Nicholas II, is now on the managerial staff of the Plaza Hotel in New York. Two or three months ago, in the course of his duties at the hotel, while assigning rooms to a small group of Soviet naval officers, he risked addressing them in Russian. He told them that of course he used to be a nobleman and a Czarist and White Guard officer, but that as a good Russian nationalist he was thrilled by the military prowess and successes of new Russia. "Had I been there now, I would have fought again, together with you men," he remarked. The Soviet officers said they were delighted, and invited the Count for a few drinks at the hotel bar. The Count warned them that after all he had been a White and that perhaps it might be of dangerous consequence to those Reds were they to associate with him publicly. But the Red officers waved his warnings away. "It's all buried and forgotten," they said in effect, "aren't we all Russians now?" And so the new friends drank, and later, through the Count, the Soviet visitors met a few more ex-Whites in New York.

My acquaintance added that this was a common occurrence in New York these days: "Our ex-Whites are falling over one another in their rush to meet the Red officers visiting American shores, while the simpler members of the local

~~SECRET~~

Russian colony, that is, non-intellectuals and men of non-noble origin, chum around with Red sailors." As an after-thought, Tarsaidze remarked: "However, after the desertion of Kravchenko from the Soviets last April, some of the Red officers and men seem to be slightly more reserved and reluctant in their willingness to accept the attentions of the local Russians. And naturally, the more recent desertion of several Soviet sailors from a Russian ship in Seattle didn't help matters either."

An interesting new element in the life of the right-wing Russians in New York is the recent rumor that among German prisoners-of-war, brought to this country from France, were a number of Georgians and other Russian "Orientals" who had served in the Reichswehr (as part of General Vlasov's quisling army). The head of the Georgian society in New York (with a membership of about 100) is reported to be trying to secure permission for himself and his fellow-Georgians in New York to visit the Georgian prisoners in their American camps "as an act of charity." I was told that the president of the Georgian society was going to write to General Marshall about it.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET
This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Act, 50 U.S.C. 31 and 32, as amended. Its transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

C O P Y

77

FOREIGN NATIONALITY GROUPS IN THE UNITED STATES

MEMORANDUM BY THE FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH
TO THE DIRECTOR OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

NUMBER 211

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

RUSSIAN NATIONALISM REALIGNS THE ANTI-BOLSHEVIK RUSSIANS

An article by Alexander Kerensky approving Soviet territorial demands has aroused a notable debate among the Russian non-Bolshevik leftists and liberals in the United States, the stalwarts of anti-Bolshevism making front against Kerensky and the new advocates of Russian national interest. The debate illuminates a fast moving tide among the non-Bolshevik Russians here. Pride in the triumphs of Soviet nationalism since 1941 has filled Social Democrats, Social Revolutionaries, and "Cadets" with a patriotic fervor exceeded only by that of former Czarist aristocrats. The opposition to Moscow continues to be sustained only by some unyielding champions of principle on the Left and a small residue of die-hards on the Right.

This paper (1) enumerates the principal personalities among the Russian non-Bolshevik Left in the United States and indicates their positions in the Kerensky debate; (2) relates how the nationalist-ideological split has developed in the non-Bolshevik Left; and (3) describes the concurrent realignment on the Right.

I. STORM OVER KERENSKY

IN THE April 1944 issue of the most respected quarterly of the Russian emigration in America, *Novyi Zhurnal*, the former head of the Provisional Government of Russia, Alexander Kerensky, who had for some time been showing an increasingly nationalistic sentiment, published an article which strongly upheld the territorial demands of the Soviet Union. He argued that Russia's attempt to secure herself through strategic frontiers "against the threat of a new attack on the part of any coalition of powers whatever" was not an imperialistic but "a defensive and *restorative* aim," nowise differing from the desire of Great Britain and the United States for strategic bases. He challenged

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 2 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

arguments that the territories in question would be sovietized, that these territories had been renounced by the Soviets at an earlier time, that strategic land boundaries were useless nowadays, and that the Atlantic Charter was applicable to the border question. He deplored talk of *cordons sanitaires*, sanctions, and a third World War against the Soviet Union. He appealed to Russians everywhere to support Russia not only on the field of battle but also "in the diplomatic struggle." Russia's new nationalism, he concluded, need not be feared. The Russian people sought no world hegemony and would not follow the Kremlin into any imperialistic adventure. Yet they were sure to march solidly behind the same Kremlin if, under the pretext of countering Russian imperialism, the powers undertook to drive Russia back to the "never to be forgotten Brest-Litovsk and Versailles borders...."

Novyi Zhurnal
Advisers Meet

Kerensky's article precipitated a hail of protests from prominent contributors of the *Novyi Zhurnal*, and the editors, Michael Karpovich and Michael Zetlin, felt obliged to call a special meeting of the journal's editorial consulting group to discuss Kerensky's stand. In the stormy free-for-all which raged at this meeting — held the last week in April — six members took the side of Kerensky, who vigorously defended his own views. Ten others opposed him.

The editors themselves held to a non-partisan position, though personally sympathizing with the opposition. Professor Karpovich, a longtime Social Revolutionary, was Secretary to the Russian Ambassador at Washington under the Provisional Government. Author of *Russo-Polish Relations* and other works, Karpovich has been since 1927 professor of Russian history at Harvard University. He is also an associate editor of *The Russian Review*. Michael Zetlin, an authority on the history of Russian music, was a principal contributor of the *Sovremennyya Zapiski*, a Russian literary journal published in Paris until the outbreak of the war. *Novyi Zhurnal* is in a sense the successor to *Sovremennyya Zapiski*.

Line-up for
Kerensky's Stand

The six who lined up with Kerensky were: Professor Nicholas S. Timasheff, Professor Pitirim A. Sorokin, Nicholas S. Kalashnikoff, Helen Iswolsky, G. P. Fedotov, and Professor Max Laserson.

Timasheff, professor of sociology at Fordham University and author of *Religion in Soviet Russia*, published in 1942, is rightist in general trend of

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 3 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

thought and a fervent Russian nationalist as well. Historically, every Russian government, he insisted, including the Soviet, had followed a consistent line on certain questions; in our day this took the form of "a persistent demand for a border stretching from the mouth of the Niemen, along the Western Bug and Carpathians, to the mouth of the Danube."

Professor Sorokin, head of the sociology department at Harvard and author of a number of volumes on the sociology of our times, is a former Social Revolutionary of the Right, who served in Kerensky's cabinet and was a member of the short-lived Constituent Assembly of 1918. Exiled from Russia in 1922, he came to the United States the following year and was naturalized in 1930. Sorokin, who claims a broad understanding of both countries, has engaged during the past year in a veritable crusade for Soviet-American friendship and has recently published a book, *Russia and the United States*, specifically dedicated to that purpose.

Siberian-born novelist Nicholas Kalashnikoff, author of *They That Take the Sword* (1939), is also a former Social Revolutionary. Long an anti-Stalinist, his attitude appears to have been considerably modified of late by a keen feeling for the plight and prowess of the Russian people.

Madame Iswolsky, daughter of Russia's famous Foreign Minister (1906-1910), and author of *Light Before Dusk, A Russian Catholic in France* (1942), and *Soul of Russia* (1943), is a former "Cadet" or Constitutional Democrat. Driven by a conviction of the need to unite the Catholic and Orthodox churches and possessed of a mystic belief in the Russian people, her faith in the predestined continuity of Russia's national history has led her more and more to a defense of the present regime and of the course it is pursuing.

Fedotov, a professor of medieval history in pre-revolutionary Russia and a staff-member of the Russian Theological Academy in Paris in later years, is a "Religious Socialist" and is said to be an advocate of union between the Anglican and the Orthodox churches. His belief in the need for a *Pax Atlantica*, to be imposed by an Anglo-Saxon federation which would lead humanity to a united, world fatherland, does not prevent him from considering Russia's border policies as primarily defensive and from seeing justice in her search for a sphere of security in Eastern Europe.

Professor Laserson, an economist from Riga and a former member of the Latvian parliament, is the author of a documentary pamphlet on the history

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 4 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

of Soviet foreign policy, in which he concluded that Soviet Russia had abandoned its early goal of universal revolution. He has come to view with increasing approval Russia's territorial policies vis-a-vis her neighbors.

Against Kerensky's Position The ten who came out in opposition to Kerensky's views at the April meeting comprise an array of leading members among the Russian non-Bolshevik Left in the United States: Boris Nikolaevsky, David J. Dallin, George Denicke, Solomon S. Schwarz, Vera Alexandrova, and V. S. Voitinsky — Social Democrats; Victor Chernov, Vladimir Zenzinov, Mark Vishniak, and Mark Aldanov — Social Revolutionaries.

Boris Nikolaevsky spent years in Germany and France following his exile from Russia in 1922. He is deemed an expert on world revolutionary movements, especially the Russian, and has wide contacts in labor circles in many countries. Once head of the Paris branch of the Amsterdam International Institute of Social History, he now directs the American Archive and Research Institute in New York City. An inveterate ideological foe of Stalinism, Nikolaevsky — a brother-in-law of the liquidated Soviet Premier Alexei Rykov — has concentrated for years on the disclosure of what he regards as Communist Machiavellianism in the foreign and domestic policies of Soviet Russia.

David J. Dallin author of *Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy, 1939-1942* (1942) and *Russia and Postwar Europe* (1943), is considered the least sanguine of the Social Democrats in his estimate of Russia's readiness to forsake expansion and collaborate in effective international organization for peace.

George Denicke, Russian historian and economist now working with the American Labor Conference on International Affairs, is as skeptical about Russia's intentions as Dallin and advocates a new "Holy Alliance" of the democracies, with France restored as a full ally and playing a pivotal role in the preservation of European civilization.

Solomon Schwarz, Russian lawyer and economist, is the co-author (with Gregory Bienstock and Aaron Yugow) of the recently published *Management in Russian Industry and Agriculture*. His wife, Vera Alexandrova, daughter of a former general, is a prominent Russian literary critic, now writing a series of articles on "Men and Thoughts of Contemporary Russia" in the New York daily *Novoye Russkoye Slovo*. Though sharing the basic views of the majority faction of the Social Democrats with regard to the Soviet regime and its policies,

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 5 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

both Schwarz and Alexandrova are less assertive than the others in the group.

V. S. Voitinsky, economist, statistician, and author of *The World in Figures*, published in German, was a Bolshevik Social Democrat before March 1917, but later turned Menshevik when unity between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks proved unattainable. His siding with Kerensky's opponents on the territorial question is the more remarkable since he himself has recently written that Russia's decisive role in the struggle with Germany entitles her to "a special position in postwar Europe" and that it would be a tragic error if the European military alliance which he advocates "would become an organization for the defense of Europe against the Russian danger."

Critical of Kerensky, but more restrained in tone than the Social Democrats were the Social Revolutionaries Chernov, Zenzinov, Vishniak and Aldanov. Victor Chernov, who recently marked his seventieth birthday,* is the recognized leader of the Social Revolutionaries and one-time Minister of Agriculture in Kerensky's cabinet as well as president of the short-lived Constituent Assembly in January 1918. Chernov is proud of the Russian soldier as symbol of the Russian people and is still hopeful that the latter will ultimately regain democratic liberties as their just due. Such liberties, in Chernov's view, would include the right of the peoples of Russia to "secede" from the USSR and subsequently to coalesce voluntarily with other nations east of Scandinavia, Germany, and Italy into a "Free Union of the Peoples of the East," around the Slavic massif.

Vladimir Zenzinov, author of *The Road to Oblivion* (1931), is another old Social Revolutionary leader. Formerly publisher of *La Russie Opprimée* in Paris and now one of the editors of the irregularly appearing party organ *Za Svobodu*, Zenzinov has stood close to Chernov for many years, but appears to be sharper than the latter now in condemnation of the existing Russian regime.

Mark Aldanov, the widely-traveled author of the 1943 best-seller *The Fifth Seal*, left Russia in November 1918 and for many years resided in Paris, where he collaborated on various Russian publications until his departure for New York in 1941. Although he believes that there are no distinct "emigre" and "Soviet" literatures, but only a single common "Russian literature," and though he claims to eschew politics as a rule, Aldanov does not conceal his general anti-Bolshevik outlook.

*See "The Non-Bolshevik Left Foregatherers," FN Number B-183 of 10 April 1944.

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 6 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

Mark Vishniak, expert on international law and journalist of note, who was the elected Secretary of the 1918 Constituent Assembly, was one of the founders of the *Sovremennyya Zapiski* in Paris and is one of the editors of *Za Svobodu* in New York. With sharp pen and tenacity of spirit Vishniak has for years pounded at the thesis that Russians everywhere must expose the evils of the Stalin regime and publicly proclaim that "only the abolition of the terrorist dictatorship in Russia can restore peace in Russia and peace in the entire world."

Extension of the Debate The meeting of the *Novyi Zhurnal* editorial consultants did not end the debate on Kerensky's stand. Bitter attacks against his views were carried in the mid-May issue of *Socialistichesky Vestnik*, organ of the majority faction of the Russian Social Democrats, and became the property of wider sections of the Russian-American community through republication in the New York daily *Novoye Russkoye Slovo*, 26 May.

In substance these attacks, written by Raphael Abramovitch, head of the majority faction of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, and David Dallin, charged Kerensky with doing great harm to the cause of democracy by supporting such outmoded measures for guaranteeing security as "strategic frontiers" and "spheres of influence," instead of the "new international order," which would guarantee the rights of small and large nations alike. Were Kerensky's "patriotic" position to be taken up by the people of every country, warned Abramovitch, Europe would become an armed camp and the world would enter a "super-imperialist epoch" inevitably leading to World War III.

Chiding Kerensky with loss of calm and firmness and with having caused rejoicing in the camp of his enemies, Dallin took him most severely to task for identifying the Russian people with the Stalin regime and for believing that "strategic frontiers" could protect Russia against "any coalition of powers." A sound foreign policy, which would leave truly independent states on its borders, would yield Russia far more security than a policy of maintaining "friendly" governments in neighboring states, severing from Germany her eastern provinces, etc. Granted, said Dallin, that England and the United States were pursuing selfish interests no less than Russia, there was still a difference between the acquisition of bases in Iceland or the Carolines and the occupation of Finland or Poland, because "Europe is a problem *suis generis*" and its peoples were entitled to particular consideration. It was true that the

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 7 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

Baltic region had a special importance for Russia under whatever regime and that Poland's right to Eastern Poland was highly doubtful, but — and this Dallin charged above all — Kerensky the Russian nationalist was actually exhibiting "a heartless attitude" when he approved bringing the inhabitants of those territories under the terrorist sway of Moscow.

Kerensky's Answer
and the *Socialistichesky*
Vestnik's Rejoinder

Stung by these accusations, Kerensky addressed a letter to the *Socialistichesky Vestnik*, which was published in the issue of 20 June. He complained that indiscriminate use had been made of the text of his article. Vigorously denying that he equated the people of Russia and their government or that he was against a new world order, Kerensky blamed Dallin for imputing to him the phrase "restoration of the Western borders of the [Russian] Empire," insisted that defense of a just frontier between Russia and Poland did not constitute an attempt on the latter's independence, and begged off.

The editors of *Socialistichesky Vestnik* were in no mood, however, to forgive what they considered to be a grave defection from the ranks of anti-Stalinist Russians. In an answer by Dallin and an editorial statement in the same issue, they noted Kerensky's limitation of Russia's territorial demands to the Baltic, East Poland, and Bessarabia, poked fun at Kerensky's idea that the re-acquisition of these territories would secure Russia against "any coalition of powers whatever," and alluded again to the fate that would befall the twenty to twenty-five million people living in these regions. Russian democrats must always remember, the editors concluded, how masterfully the Soviet Government used every word of its political opponents for the purposes of its own policy.

Other Voices
in the Storm

Support for Kerensky's position on Russia's security policies came, however, from other quarters. *Novyi Put*, organ of the minority, pro-Stalinist faction of the Russian Social Democrats, carried on 25 June an article by A. Kober bidding Poland once and for all to shed her "megalomaniac" urge to play the role of a great power, heading "federations," and ruling other peoples, and to accept the offers and seek the friendship of Soviet Russia, because "the Soviet Union and only the Soviet Union" could guarantee for her national independence and a peaceful existence.

In the July-August issue of *Novosselye*, monthly literary journal edited by

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 8 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

Nicholas Avksentiev's daughter, the poetess Sophia Pregel, there appeared two articles strongly upholding the basic Soviet security theses which Kerensky had maintained. In one of them, Charles Breiner, once a member of the St. Petersburg Duma, reviewing Soviet foreign policy, refuted the familiar charge among the emigres that it was aggressive, false, revolutionary, and imperialistic.

In another article entitled "About Spheres of Influence and the 'Giants of Thought'," V. Sukhomlin, oppositionist Social Revolutionary, berated Abramovitch, Dallin, Friedrich Stampfer, and other European Social Democrats. Their rejection of the Teheran policy as oppressive of small states and their demand for "supra-national patriotism," said Sukhomlin, concealed a fear of Russia and a desire to have her excluded from the affairs of Europe. The most that was agreed at Teheran, asserted Sukhomlin, was to abstain from demanding that Russia renounce Ukrainian and White Russian territories or consent to the formation of "doll states" dependent on Poland in the Baltic. Russia did not intend to oppress the people of Poland and would protect the latter from the German danger, but any effort to restore the Poland of Versailles would be a vain and dangerous undertaking. A European federation would mean domination by Germany. But "security zones" were a different matter, for insofar as the Big Three might cooperate in the post-war world, Sukhomlin concluded, such zones would help to prevent aggression.

This debate on the course of Soviet foreign policy and its meaning for Russia and the world throws into relief the split which has been growing among the non-Bolsheviks of the Russian-American colony — those of the Left and those of the Right as well. How nationalist enthusiasm for Russian achievements under the Soviets is deepening the split, is set forth in the sections which follow, first with regard to the Left and then with regard to the Right.

II. THE SPLIT IN THE NON-BOLSHEVIK LEFT

The Russian-American non-Bolshevik Left comprises several groups of Social Democrats and Social Revolutionaries. Perhaps individual former members of the party of "Cadets" (Constitutional Democrats) might also be included.

Before the present war, the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party (Menshevik) and the Russian Social Revolutionary Party had only individual adherents and sympathizers in America and they displayed little notable activity.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 9 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

The situation altered when these modest ranks were swelled by prominent Social Democratic and Social Revolutionary leaders who arrived in the United States after the collapse of France. Historically, it may be recalled, the difference between the two parties lay in the fact that the Social Democrats focused on Russia's urban working class, which was to be assisted toward socialism by the foreign proletariat in accordance with Marxist dogma, while the Social Revolutionaries looked toward action by the peasant masses of Russia. This difference in programmatic outlook had nearly disappeared by 1917 and the two parties cooperated in the Kerensky government. During the Civil War (1918-1921) they drifted apart, but the division was repaired in subsequent years and finally healed — first in Paris and later in New York — by the beginning of World War II. The cleavage in the non-Bolshevik Left runs at present between factions drawn from both groups and has to do with acceptance or rejection of the Stalinist regime.

1. THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATS

When at the end of the Civil War in Russia the Communist Party acquired a monopoly of legality and all other political parties were banned, exiled leaders of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party (Menshevik) formed a so-called Foreign Delegation of the party in Berlin to represent the silenced ranks of its adherents in Russia and unite all Russian Social Democrats abroad. Until 1939, this Foreign Delegation — led originally by L. Martov, its chairman, Theodore Dan, and Raphael Abramovitch, and chairmanned by Dan since Martov's death in 1923 — functioned harmoniously, presenting its views to the world through the party organ, *Socialistichesky Vestnik*.*

In that year a schism developed over Dan's position. Dan favored a united front with the Communists and a policy of winning Russia back for the anti-Hitler front as the means to a socialist Europe. A majority of the Foreign Delegation, centered in Paris after the rise of Nazism in Germany, seeing no salvation for either Russia or socialism without a complete defeat of Stalinism, opposed Dan's view and elected Abramovitch to his place as chairman of the Delegation and its representative in the Socialist International. Dan and the

*For a description of this and other Russian emigre organs mentioned in this paper see, "The Russian-Language Press in the United States," FN Number 190 of 15 May 1944.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 10 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

minority of the members who followed him responded by establishing their own publication *Novyi Put*, which like *Socialistichesky Vestnik* was brought to New York with the arrival of the two groups in the United States. The split between the two factions grew progressively wider. In February 1942 the Dan group formally seceded by publicly proclaiming that it would no longer be responsible for the policy of the majority of the Foreign Delegation. The Dan group has since then consistently questioned the right of the Foreign Delegation to speak for Russian Social Democracy.

*The Position of
the Abramovitch
Faction*

The position of the majority faction under Abramovitch — whose long-standing hostility to Bolshevism is heightened by the bitter memory of the passing of his son, alleged to have been liquidated by the Communists in the Spanish Civil War — continues to hinge on the question of Russia under the rule of Stalin. To be sure, on 23 June 1941, the day after the Nazi attack on Russia, the faction took a stand of "critical defensism," declaring that, "The party is directed toward the defense of Russian soil against Hitler aggression and subordinates the struggle for the elimination of Stalin despotism to the higher interests of the war against world fascism, the worst and most dangerous enemy of human civilization." But with the progress of the war the increasing accent was on "criticism" rather than "defense," and in February 1944 the group publicly rescinded its earlier declaration in order to free its hands for full-scale attacks on Russia's regime and its policies.

In April 1943, the majority faction issued a statement which condemned Moscow's rupture with the Polish Government-in-Exile as aimed at the ultimate conversion of Poland into a "vassal country," and declared that such tactics "destroy all opportunities to create a new European and world order based on a democratic community of large and small nations" and violated the principles of the Atlantic Charter "which alone serve the interests of the Socialist proletariat as well." The crux of the faction's views is presented in the following conclusion to a recent editorial in *Socialistichesky Vestnik*:

One of the most terrible tragedies of the last quarter of a century is the fact that in our country, in the very Russia which participates so amazingly in the annihilation of the National-Socialist barbarism... a system of barbarism was created which presents itself to the world as socialism! Victory can be liberating, but only if the victors are capable of carrying freedom to the soil which they win or conquer. Of this the West is capable — with all its shortcomings,

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 11 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

vices, and sins. Our Russian East is incapable of this at present. Therein is the drama which we have been living through for three years already — desiring passionately the victory of our country and despising at the same time the barbarism which rules within it. For us, there can be no full and genuine victory without the victory of freedom in Russia.

In these sentiments the majority (Abramovitch) faction of the Russian Social Democrats, numbering more than 100 members, is intimately associated with the Jewish Labor Committee — which is said to be supporting it financially — and with the Social Democratic Federation and *The New Leader* group, which accords it space at the Rand School of Social Science in New York.

*The Stand of
the Dan Group*

When Theodore Dan formed his own little group in Paris at the end of 1939, he explained the break with the majority of the Russian Social Democrats in Left-Socialist rather than in pro-Stalinist terms. Stalinism, said he, was threatening the achievements of the revolution in Russia and was aiding the forces of reaction everywhere. Yet, the goal of a socialist Europe could best be advanced not by the liquidation of Stalinism through military defeat — since that would only strengthen international Hitlerism — but by bringing Russia back into the anti-Nazi front. The statement published by the Dan group at the time of Hitler's attack on Russia did not differ markedly from that of the Abramovitch faction, and during the first months of the conflict critical comments concerning the Soviets could be found here and there in the group's organ *Novyi Put*. Soon thereafter, however, these completely disappeared. Since then domestic policy has been rarely referred to in the journal, and that in terms of approval, while all decisive points of Stalin's foreign policy — Poland, the Baltic countries, Finland, the Balkans, etc. — have been wholeheartedly supported.

The Dan group has held, as fundamental thesis, that Russia's performance in the war showed the people to be solidly behind the Soviet Government, while externally the Soviet Union was performing a mission of liberation by warring upon fascism, and one might look forward to a fusion of the Russian revolution and emerging social-revolutionary movements elsewhere in Europe. The Moscow and Teheran conferences, according to a recent issue of *Novyi Put* (25 June), signified that the two tendencies represented in the United Nations

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 12 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

coalition — “the socially-conservative one of Anglo-American democracy and the socially-revolutionary one of the Soviet Union” — had agreed to renounce forcible suppression of each other, leaving the historical tug-of-war between them to be decided by “the dynamics of the war itself.” The dynamics of the war had come to spell social revolution in Europe, *Novyi Put* said, and were the Allied armies to attempt to contain these dynamics within purely political bounds, the result would only be prolonged civil war and a threat to victory. The sun of peace and freedom, *Novyi Put* concluded, would shine the sooner, the sooner there might come “a triple victorious alliance of Anglo-American democracy and Soviet Communism with the European Socialist revolution which is making today its first hesitant steps but will body forth tomorrow in all its tragic greatness and invincible might.”

The Dan group numbers about thirty members in New York City. So far unrecognized by the Communists and isolated from the Russian refugee Socialists and American Social Democrats alike, it finds the going very hard. Complaining that it was not fortunate enough to receive any subsidies from American organizations, such as “other Russian organs of the same type” enjoy, *Novyi Put* recently appealed to its subscribers for funds, claiming that only support by a number of sculptors and painters had enabled it to come out with regularity during the past year. The moving spirit of the group, organizationally, is Aaron Yugow. But its guiding ideologist is still the old leader Dan.

Theodore Dan seems altogether sincere in his vision of impending European revolutions aided and abetted by Communist Russia, and these expectations he holds in common with Friedrich Adler and a number of other European Socialist refugees. But to many of Dan's colleagues of the non-Bolshevik Left who have shared with him the long years of exile, it is strange to see this once fiery tribune of Russian Socialism appear to make his peace with Bolshevism after waging relentless war upon it during two full decades. Not a few of them, wearied by adversity and hopes deferred, and simultaneously impressed by the victories of the Soviets, have found in Dan moral justification for their own reorientation. They join his ultra-leftist camp only to make a full transition to Stalinism afterwards. The essential significance of the Dan group thus becomes that of a bridge leading Russian Socialists along the road of reconciliation with the once-hated Communist regime.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 13 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

2. THE SOCIAL REVOLUTIONARIES

A schism not unlike that of the Russian Social Democrats, though less violently pursued, has developed among the Russian Social Revolutionaries, where a majority group of about twenty-five led by Victor Chernov, Vladimir Zenzinov, and Mark Vishniak, is opposed by less than a dozen dissidents. Even in Paris, before the war broke out in 1939, numerous individuals among the Russian Social Revolutionaries had acquired a sympathy for Stalin. They manfully endeavored to maintain this attitude during the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact, and forthwith after the Soviet Union entered the war, broke with the Social Revolutionary Party. The division continued among the Social Revolutionary refugees after their arrival in this country, for a Party declaration of 25 June 1941, proposing to subordinate the struggle for civil liberties in Russia to the needs of its defense and the war against fascism, did not go far enough to satisfy the dissident minority.

Generally, the attitude of the majority group of Social Revolutionaries toward the Soviet regime and its role in world affairs has not been markedly different from that of the majority faction of Social Democrats. Its views are presented in the small party organ *Za Svobodu*.

The dissident minority call themselves "Socialist Revolutionaries Defensists," but do not function now as an organized group and have never attempted to set up their own press. Instead they present their views in other Russian publications. The best known among them are V. Sukhomlin, Mark Slonim, E. Stalinsky, and Vladimir Lebedev. The first two are said to have become typical fellow-travelers by now, but Slonim, who lectures widely both in Russian and English to Russian-American audiences, shows on occasions independence from the Stalinist line.

Stalinsky is probably less involved, yet in systematic contributions to *Novoye Russkoye Slovo*, which have earned for him the lavish praise of the Communist-line *Russky Golos*, he has shown himself a pliant apologist for all the turns of Russian foreign policy. He has been particularly emphatic in opposing plans for European federation and in asserting the view that Russia has saved humanity from slavery and, as a mighty power which has abandoned isolation, is laying a firm foundation for the future peace structure through close ties with England and the United States.

Lebedev, one-time Assistant Secretary of War in the Kerensky government and now assistant editor of *Novoye Russkoye Slovo*, seems less disposed than his

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

4

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 14 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

associates to follow the straight pro-Soviet line. He has preserved a good deal of individualism, particularly in his appraisal of the Free Germany Committee in Moscow, the Yugoslav, and other situations. In a recent article, Lebedev called the Russian purges of 1937-38 a fundamental political retreat, which liquidated the early, revolutionary elite of the Communist Party and much of its ideology as well, and which had resulted in a reliance by the still dictatorial but evolving regime on the broad non-Party masses. Numerous additional concessions granted the masses in the course of the war and replacement of the remaining marshals and generals of the early revolutionary period with professional soldiers who had proved their mettle in battle, had transformed the Red Army, Lebedev concluded, into a genuine army of Russia and the war itself into a truly patriotic struggle for the fatherland.

3. THE CONSTITUTIONAL DEMOCRATS

In concluding this survey of the Russian non-Bolshevik Left in the United States it may not be too much out of bounds to consider the position of the former "Cadets" or members of the Constitutional Democratic Party. Once this Party stood for a democratic monarchy, and had led in the armed struggle against the Bolsheviks. Among the Paris emigration the Party reconstituted itself as a "Republican-Democratic Alliance" under the leadership of the historian Paul Miliukov, who had been Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Russian Provisional Government of 1917. In 1939-40, the "Cadets," whose nationalism had enabled some of them to accept in 1918 the idea of German collaboration, now greeted the Soviet Union's territorial expansion with thinly veiled elation.

"In this war Russia has her special interests," wrote Miliukov in one of the last articles before his death in 1943. "They concern the question of the territories of the former Russian empire on its western borders—the territories which were lost at the time when the Bolsheviks seized power." At the same time, as a by-product of the appreciation for Russia's new foreign policy which began to appear in the Party's paper, the Paris Russian daily *Poslednia Novosti*, there emerged a tendency to pass a more benevolent judgment on Russia's regime itself. With the Nazi attack on Russia, the "Cadet" group went on record for defense of the Soviet Union and surcease of criticism for the duration.

Nothing has been heard of the group in Paris since Miliukov's death. In the United States no organized group of "Cadets" exists, but individual former

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 15 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

members, such as S. Poliakoff-Litovtseff, who writes regularly in *Novoye Russkoye Slovo*, Mme Iswolsky, and others, have continued to develop the newer attitude toward Soviet Russia.

III. THE REALIGNMENT ON THE RIGHT

The Russian-American Right is made up almost exclusively of members of the so-called "White" emigration, i. e. former officers, soldiers, churchmen, and intellectuals who were identified with the monarchist cause in Russia. About 30,000 of them migrated to the United States during the early 'twenties. While the more extremist organizations among the rightists have ceased to exist or have become quiescent since Pearl Harbor—only the daily *Rossiia* reflecting their sentiments—signs are manifold that also in the ranks of the Right a new feeling about Soviet Russia and an ardent pride in its achievements are replacing the old disgust and hate.

1. THE EARLIER RECONCILIATIONISTS

The moods which have nourished the mounting change may be observed in the Society of Russian Officers and War Department Officials. This society, formed in New York in 1941 under the leadership of General Nikolai N. Rudson, took an early stand favoring all forms of aid to Russia. There were some internal squabbles on the issue and a change in the Society's leadership in 1942. However, the Soviet-friendly attitude persisted under the new president, General P. I. Konovaloff. The Society took a strong stand for a Second Front in 1942, expressing the hope that its opinion "will be taken into consideration by the responsible military circles of this country [the United States] which is now our country."

More recently, at a banquet on the third anniversary of the Soviet-German war, Colonel K. E. Kuviazhev, vice president of the Society, elaborated the view that the war was being carried on not by the Soviet Government but by all the peoples of Russia. He appealed to the Russian emigration to forget its hostility to the Soviet regime and to follow the Society's example in rendering aid to the Russian fatherland. Commenting on the seeming paradox of such an attitude on the part of Imperial Russian officers, one of them, Iu. Bolotovskiy, a member of the Circle of Russian Jurists in New York, explained in *Novoye Russkoye Slovo* (22 June) that the change was wrought by the "great miracle" which had come about in Russia.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 16 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

The "Whites," he wrote, opposed the "shameful Brest-Litovsk peace," the giving up by the Bolsheviks of border provinces, and the substitution of an international ideology for national ideals. But now all that was reversed; the sacrifices of the "Whites" had, plainly, not been in vain. Russia had restored the values of its national culture, re-established the church, and was coming out before the world in "such national glory, in such greatness and with such moral prestige, as the most ardent of the great Russian patriots never dreamt of." Bolotovskiy confessed his inability to say whether the current change was a temporary yielding or a lasting transformation, but he signaled faith for the future by citing the mystic words of the nineteenth century Russian poet and diplomat Tyutchev—widely quoted of late in Russian papers:

"With mind can Russia not be grasped,
With common yardstick not be measured,
It has a stature all its own
In Russia one can only believe!"

Bolotovskiy concluded: "We believe because we can no longer live without faith. . . ."

*Kasem-Beg and
the "Mladorossy"*

Another instance of early reconciliation is found in the small *Mladoross* (Young Russian) party. This was an offshoot of a movement claimed by its leader Alexander L. Kasem-Beg (son of an important Czarist official) to have counted 15,000 members in various countries at one time. Monarchist and nationalist, founded in Munich in 1923, the movement sought to synthesize Czardom with the Soviet system and hoped to bring a "Soviet Czar" to power in Russia in the person of the Grand Duke Vladimir, son of the late Pretender to the Russian throne, Grand Duke Cyril. Kasem-Beg had some personal touch with both Hitler and Mussolini and his party's tenets bore the unmistakable earmarks of fascist philosophy.

The distinguishing feature of this group, however, which set it off from other Russian fascist and monarchist groups was a Russian nationalism so deep-seated as to prevent it from accepting defeatism and foreign intervention as means of gaining power in Russia. It was indeed on this very issue that an agreement concluded in Berlin in the fall of 1933 between Kasem-Beg for the *Mladorossy* and Bernard Avalov and Anastase Vonsiatsky for the Russian Nazis and Russian Fascists respectively, broke down six months later. A Russian nationalist first and foremost, Kasem-Beg feared German expansion at

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 17 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

Russia's expense. In 1938 he made clear his party's readiness to collaborate with all countries which would resist German imperialism, and repeated the pledge in 1939 to the French and British Governments.

Soon after his arrival in the United States in the autumn of 1941 Kasem-Beg made a lecture tour among the Russian emigres and demanded that they should unreservedly support the Soviet Government for the duration. To show the sincerity of his demand he dissolved the *Mladoross* group in New York. In May 1942 he went farther on the road of reconciliation with the Soviets, declaring that a "miracle" had taken place, that "the Russian revolution has rejoined the Russian tradition; they are united in the name of the Russian future." On the basis of this dominant thought he has since given full support to all Soviet policies in his lectures and in the contributions which he regularly makes to the San Francisco Russian daily *Novaya Zarya*. In an article in that paper (24 June) Kasem-Beg quotes from Russia's lore of the ages to pay a glowing tribute to the Russian people, its Army and its leaders, and he bespeaks enduring friendship between Soviet Russia, England, and America.

In view of Kasem-Beg's long advocacy of Czarist restoration, his references to Stalin are of particular interest. Enumerating Russia's great leaders and warriors of the past, Kasem-Beg wrote that they had a worthy successor in the present leader whom the Patriarch of Russia had with reason called "God-given." The three past years had brought "a great victory of the people, but also a tremendous personal success for their leader," for it was the leader's will and foresight that were responsible for the preparedness on which the fate of Russia and the world had hung. Therefore, in "praising the [Red] Army, one cannot fail to bow before its creator and leader." This article was printed also in the Communist-line *Russky Golos*. It is said to have made a profound impression among the Russian rightists.

Still another example of the growing impulsion towards a *rapprochement* with the Soviets is offered by the Czarists grouped around *Russkaya Zhizn*, San Francisco daily supported by the Russian Center and the United Committee of Russian National Organizations of that city. At the time of the Nazi attack on Russia, *Russkaya Zhizn*, like its New York counterpart, *Rossiia*, viewed the German invasion with approval. Later in the year, however, after the membership of the Russian Center was purged of people who "could not adjust them-

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 18 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

selves in a timely fashion to the changes in the political situation," the editorial policy of *Russkaya Zhizn* also underwent a change, advocating support for the war effort and aid to Russia. It had not become reconciled to the Soviet regime, the paper declared in the fall of 1942, but it saw harm in raising that question in the face of Russia's danger. As the war has progressed it has displayed an even more conciliatory attitude toward the Soviets and has fully endorsed Stalin's foreign policies.

Russkaya Zhizn calls itself a "non-party public-democratic newspaper" but the groups which it represents have never completely forsaken their Czarist sentiments. In July of this year they met at the Russian Center to commemorate in speeches and prayers the murder of Emperor Nicholas II and his family. At the same time, without renouncing the right to depict the negative aspects of Communism, *Russkaya Zhizn* has, during recent months particularly, recorded its belief that Stalin was not seeking to implant Communism in Poland, Germany, or elsewhere; and it has found cause for rejoicing in the internal changes introduced by the Soviet Government. Commenting on the new Soviet legislation concerning marriage and the family, *Russkaya Zhizn* said (12 July) that the war "has brought a moral rehabilitation to our homeland. Soviet Russia is becoming the Russia which we wanted it to be." On another occasion (20 July), the fundamental present position of the *Russkaya Zhizn* group of Czarists was set forth in the following terms:

At the present time, this common national unity of ours is felt more than before. Now, when the great war for the existence of Russia has awakened in all Russian people the best national feelings, Russia has found herself again. She revalues her present, turning to the past, glorifies the heroes who created Russia's glory, is proud of its Czars, is interested in its classical literature, recites Pushkin's poems, and delights in Chaikovsky's music. This makes the new Russia kindred to us, and we in our turn accept and value everything of talent which has arisen there since the revolution.

2. THE NEWEST "UNITY" ADHERENTS

The realignment on the Right springs mainly from the impact of Russian events themselves, but there has also been a pressure of opinion proceeding from other sections of the Russian-American community as well as from Soviet propaganda channels. The following exhortation is from an unsigned article in the liberal *Novoye Russkoye Slovo* (10 April). The internal evidence suggests

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 19 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

that it may have been written by a member of the earlier-mentioned Society of Russian Officers:

We emigrants were robbed and ruined in Russia and forced to abandon our Fatherland. It is difficult for us to renounce that hatred towards the Bolsheviki which they have generated in us, but this we must do, and the sooner the better for us. We must not look upon the current events through spectacles of hatred. Those persons who caused us harm have either all ceased to exist or are now paying with their own lives defending their and our Fatherland. . . . And those who have remained in Russia, do they live better than we emigrants do? They hunger and freeze and are deprived of the elementary necessities of life and nevertheless they exert all their strength, show a high spiritual might, and are giving their very life for the defense of the Fatherland. Who are we, then, to judge or criticize the great Russian people!

The former Soviet Ambassador to the United States, Alexander Troyanovsky, recently contributed to the Soviet magazine *Bolshevik* an article condemning the exile Polish Government's stand on the border question as a continuation of "the reactionary policy of the imperialist clique of old, land-lord Poland" and warning that the future Poland can only be one that is friendly to Russia. It is notable that this article was republished not only in the Communist-line *Russky Golos* (2, 3 August) but also in the non-partisan and democratic *Novoye Russkoye Slovo* (28, 29 July), to which rightists contribute on occasion.

Russky Golos takes from Moscow (23 June) an article about "The Russian Soldier," written by the colorful old Russian general, Count Alexis Ignatiev, one-time Imperial military attache in Paris. He must have been born under a lucky star, Count Ignatiev wrote, to have "deserved the high honor of becoming a general in our genuinely democratic Red Army," for the soldier of this Army, who has received his epaulets in the course of the great war of the Fatherland, has outshone his brilliant ancestors in heroism and leadership.

Such articles must reach to the very hearts of former "Whites," and the ranks of the reconciliationists on the Right gain new adherents. This was illustrated recently on two occasions—the anniversary of the Nazi invasion of Russia (22 June), and the convention of the Russian-American Section of the IWO.*

*See "Communist-Line IWO Reorganizes to Emphasize Nationality," FN Number 201 of 11 July 1944.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 20 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

*Rightists' Statements
on Invasion Anniversary*

On the first occasion numerous statements and greetings were received by *Russky Golos* from its own staff members—B. Borisov, V. Kazakevich, Captain Kournakoff, and General Yakhontoff—as well as from various organizations; from Professors V. I. Tereshtenko (Columbia), Alexander Kaun (California), Louis Karpinski (Michigan); composer Nikolai Slonimsky; engineer Vladimir Iurkevich, designer of the *Normandie*; General Nikolai M. Rudson, etc. In addition messages were received from three of the oldest families of the Russian aristocracy—Count S. A. Golenishchev-Kutuzov, Prince A. M. Poutiatine, and Prince V. V. Kudashev. Count Golenishchev-Kutuzov, member of a house which originated in the thirteenth century and collateral descendant of the famous Field Marshal Kutuzov, wrote of the “new order, which is beneficent not only for the select, but also for entire humanity,” declared aggression to be foreign to the spirit of the Soviet Union, and argued the need of continued collaboration between the Great Powers in the post-war period.

Prince Poutiatine, whose father was the commandant of Tsarskoye Selo and who traces his title to the middle of the fifteenth century, argued for American-Soviet friendship on the ground that Soviet Russia's three long years of sacrifices had enabled America to prepare for the joint struggle. Prince Kudashev, of aristocratic descent tracing to Tatar Murzas in the seventeenth century, bracketed Lenin and Stalin with Alexander Nevsky, Peter the Great, Suvorov, and Kutuzov as heroes and saviors of Russia. He concluded that “the war of the fatherland of 1941 had proven that the period of great convulsions of 1917 had carried through great reforms which led to the regeneration of the Russian people.”

Rightists' Felicitations of IWO

Flushed by these responses, *Russky Golos* solicited and received Russian-American congratulations for the IWO's fourteenth convention. The names read like a veritable Who's Who of the Russian-American community: Peter V. Vysotsky, of the Russian tea magnate family; singers Mary Kurenko, Alexander Kipnis; composer A. T. Grechaninov; conductor Serge Koussevitsky; professors Pitirim A. Sorokin, George Vernadsky, Alexander Petrunkevitch, and Vladimir Simkhovitch; Metropolitan Benjamin; Peter Zubov, secretary of the New York Metropolitan Council; Bishop Makarij; the writer George Grebenshchikov; the sculptors A. Archipenko and M. I. Kononkov; and the scientist

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 21 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

Zworykin. Again the roster of felicitants included General Rudson, Count Golenischev-Kutuzov, and Prince Kudashev, while Prince Poutiatine greeted the gala opening of the Section's convention in person.

The extent and motives of the conversion of such once bitterly anti-Soviet "Whites" can be further gauged by an invasion anniversary speech of Prince Poutiatine in Detroit 25 June. The Soviet people had withstood the Nazi onslaught thanks to their extraordinary unity, Poutiatine averred, and unity had encompassed also the Russian emigration since the war: "Our motherland has united us, and around those Soviet men from whom we once departed—we now find each other. Therein, the true force of our national spirit has shown itself." Thrusting a spear in the direction of the *Rossiia* type of Russians as men who had placed their trust in Hitler and had "forgotten their oath of fealty to the fatherland, forgotten the traditions of their fathers and grandfathers," Poutiatine said that he would rather address himself to those Russians who stand half-way, who wish the victory of Russian arms, yet halt somehow before making the last step. To them he would say that "the Soviet people is in fact their people," the Red Army is "the guardian of the tradition of Russian arms," and, since an army is built on the pyramidal principle of subordination, glory and good wishes are also the full due of Marshal Stalin who prepared the country, trained the people, inspired the army and "fused the achievements of the revolution with the age-old history of our people into a single fortress." "The Russian spirit lives within us," concluded Prince Poutiatine, and "may our voices reach the walls of the Moscow Kremlin."

3. THE IRRECONCILABLES

In this widening chorus of approval for the new Russia only the New York monarchist *Rossiia* and its staunchest followers have remained totally irreconcilable. In how many instances the rank-and-file members of the Russian National Alliance in America, the Federation of Russian Combatants, the Brigadier-General Turchinoff Garrison 297, and other organizations of the extreme reactionary wing grouped around *Rossiia* have been touched by the new winds in the camp of the Right, is not known. These organizations are showing little signs of organized life at present and perhaps the desertions are not few. But there is nothing so far to indicate that the leaders — N. A. Melnikov, Archbishop Vitaly, the flier Boris Sergievsky, and above all Boris Brasol (who together with *Rossiia's* editor Rybakoff worked in close collaboration with Anastase

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 211

— 22 —

13 SEPTEMBER 1944

Vonsiatsky, chief of the Russian Fascists now serving sentence as a Japanese spy) — have altered on the Russian question. For these elements *Rossiia* continues to serve as a mouthpiece.

Prior to Pearl Harbor *Rossiia* was not only anti-Communist, anti-British, and anti-Semitic but openly pro-Nazi and pro-Japanese. Accusing England and France of provoking the war, and holding that the Comintern was their spawn, *Rossiia* rejoiced over the fall of France and looked eagerly towards "the inevitable defeat of slave-holding Great Britain." In March 1941, Yugoslavia was urged by *Rossiia* to join the Hitler bloc. The Nazi invasion of Russia was hailed with joy; and the Churchill-Roosevelt decision to crush "the Christian dictatorship of Hitler" was denominated by *Rossiia* (16 August 1941) "the most wicked and terrible event."

After Pearl Harbor *Rossiia* changed its tone to some extent, and in due course it turned against Germany because of Hitler's failure to set up a regime out of Russian fascist elements in Russia. Once seeing democracy as degenerate, *Rossiia* has now become its champion, offering as a sample of "genuinely democratic rule" the "autocracy of the Russian Czars." Often absurdly contradictory, *Rossiia's* articles show one line of consistency — undying hatred for the Soviet regime. Stalin is accused of having needlessly squandered millions of Russian lives in this war to "pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the Allies." At the same time he is presented as a partner of Japan, who is refusing to aid the Allies through bases in Russia and stands ready to make a separate peace with Hitler. He is denounced on the one hand for breaking up Russia's domain and on the other as a "Red Satan" seeking to expand the Communist sphere and spread Bolshevism throughout the world. The leitmotiv heard day in and out in all of *Rossiia's* editorials, is that the Soviet Government is a government of usurpers, that Russians abroad must unite with generals, intellectuals, and youth inside Russia to overthrow the Communist regime, and that it is the duty of the Allies and to their own best interests to aid in this task.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

Declassified Authority:

38037

By: MKS Date: 02-10-2017

SECRET
This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Act, 5 U.S.C. 71 and 72, as amended. Transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

COPY

81

FOREIGN NATIONALITY GROUPS IN THE UNITED STATES

MEMORANDUM BY THE FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH
TO THE DIRECTOR OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

NUMBER 215

25 OCTOBER 1944

SOVIET RUSSIA AND THE PEOPLES OF EUROPE: II

After a lapse of ten months the attitudes of foreign nationality groups in the United States toward Soviet Russia are examined again. This time an analysis is attempted in terms of the political forces which motivate these attitudes.

Three principal groups of political forces are recognized, and are designated respectively — (1) Communism, (2) Nationalism, and (3) Power Politics.

Regarding the first, a distinction is made between (a) Communism in the strictly Party sense and (b) the widely scattered revolutionary ferments which are being loosely spoken of as "Communist."

Under the general heading of Nationalism note is taken of the political workings of (a) Russian patriotism, and (b) Slavism.

The third rubric — Power Politics — covers three sets of practical motivations: (a) recognition of force majeure, (b) considerations of the balance of power, and (c) hope for a deus ex machina.

The following analysis, based on observation of foreign nationality groups in the United States, and set forth in accordance with the above scheme, is believed to be of interest in itself and also to throw some indirect light on the situation in Europe.

ACCOMMODATION to the new reality of Russian power and influence goes on apace among the foreign nationality groups in the United States. A survey made by this Branch last January,* when the Red armies were still fighting well behind Russia's western borders, showed those groups whose homelands were directly in the line of advance to be frank and unrelenting in their hostility to Russia. Those, such as the French, whose homelands were geographically more remote, centered their apprehensions on Germany, and toward Russia were relatively detached.

* See "Soviet Russia and the Peoples of Europe," FN Number 170 of 28 January 1944.

SECRET

CONTROL

SECRET

NUMBER 215

— 2 —

25 OCTOBER 1944

Now Russia has become the almost universal point of reference and where hostility has not mollified it has tended to become in any case much less outspoken. Accommodation with the new Colossus—sometimes willing, sometimes unwilling—has come to permeate national attitudes to a point where only the German-American group can be said to hold out in general opposition. In every other group, weighty elements in addition to the Communists and fellow travelers have, for one reason or another, joined the movement which has now set in toward acceptance and adjustment.

*Political Initiative
with Russia*

The new situation has not been brought on solely by the Red armies' successful counterattacks of this past year. Account must be taken also of the psychological campaign of Soviet and Communist inspiration which has accompanied the Russian successes in the field. The no less brilliant advances of the Allied forces in Southern and Western Europe have not been productive of an atmosphere of equal certainty respecting the policies of the governments behind those operations. Broadly speaking, the foreign nationality groups have continued to express themselves primarily in terms of Russian, rather than American or British, political intention.

For the Communists and their fellow travelers in the foreign nationality groups the successes of the armies in the field, both East and West, and the pursuit of a supposedly unified policy among the United Nations has seemed a simple enough consummation. It has come to be contained in the single word—"Teheran." For the more numerous others in the foreign nationality communities the whole development has been vastly confusing. To some of those on the farther Right, and perhaps to a few of the more romantic Communists themselves, the USSR is still the country of international revolution. The large remainder in each group apprehends that a basic change has taken place, but appraisal of the change is widely varied. For some the USSR is still a Power apart with purposes of its own. The purposes are deemed to be essentially imperial; and Moscow is thought to be using as instruments for their achievement the Communists outside of Russia, and, by "evil" perversion, the emotional appeal of a once elevated ideology. For others Russia has become simply a Great Power with the traditional designs of such.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

SECRET

NUMBER 215

— 3 —

25 OCTOBER 1944

Analysis by
Political Motivation

In order to demonstrate as clearly and briefly as possible the varying attitudes toward Russia now perceptible in the foreign nationality groups, an analysis is made by political motivation. The outline used has been indicated in the headpiece to this paper. For the reader's convenience it is repeated in schematic form:

- I. Communism
 - (a) Party Communism
 - (b) Revolutionary affinity
- II. Nationalism
 - (a) Russian patriotism
 - (b) Slavism
- III. Power Politics
 - (a) Recognition of *force majeure*
 - (b) Considerations of the balance of power
 - (c) Hope for a *deus ex machina*

It should be observed that the political forces noted operate negatively as well as positively. In some cases they attract to Russia; in others they repel no less effectively. In some cases the impulsion is opportunistic and temporary; in other cases principled and enduring.

I. COMMUNISM

(a) *Party Communism.* Of the political forces included in the above outline Party Communism of the toe-the-line type is the most concrete in its power both to attract and repel. This is so clear on the *positive* side that the steadfast alignment with Russia of the Communist and fellow-traveler elements in every foreign nationality group need be noted only this once; the reader will be counted on to make at each point in the generalizations which ensue the necessary reservations respecting Communists. Even in the case of the German group the Communists and fellow travelers are, of course, an exception to the otherwise general and outspoken anti-Russianism.

It is no less clear that the continued identification of Communism with Russia produces political effects also on the *negative* side.

Since now, under the impulse of Russian nationalism, the "party line" deviates with such an easy opportunism from the teachings of Marx, Lenin

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

SECRET

NUMBER 215

— 4 —

25 OCTOBER 1944

and the earlier Stalin, one might expect — first of all — to see pristine Communists turning in good numbers away from Russia. This Branch has been on the outlook for any development of the kind. What little has been discernible so far appears chiefly among a few Spanish and Italian exiled intellectuals.

*Socialists and
Catholics
in Opposition*

Of great and sustained political effectiveness, however, are two bodies of opposition in principle to Russian Communism and hence measurably to Russia. The Socialists of the Second International, no longer unanimously by any means but still in very important numbers, maintain their opposition to the Bolsheviks on grounds both of doctrine and of strategy. Roman Catholics and many other Christian believers, prone to condemn all Socialists for their materialism, abhor the Russian Bolsheviks particularly for their past attacks on private property, the family, religion, and the general moral order.

These elements of resistance, which extend through all the foreign nationality groups yield but unwillingly or tentatively to the opportunities or exigencies of the moment; but yielding still takes place. Many remain convinced the leopard cannot change his spots, but others "know" he has. Instances could be cited in every foreign nationality community of Socialists who have latterly become willing, or felt constrained, to embrace, at least tentatively, what once they hated.

A similar yielding can be detected among Roman Catholics and other Christians. Certainly the ingrained Catholic disapproval and dread of Marxist Communism remain very strong among Polish-Americans. Moral aversion conjoins with nationalist sentiment to arouse a stormy emotional repugnance against any conceding toward Russia, but commonsensical need has become increasingly persuasive, and those who would rather drown than swim with the Devil at all are now probably less than half in the Polish-American community.

*Tito as Croat
and as Communist*

The greater number of Croat-Americans have yielded, tentatively at least, to the opportunity for national self-expression which is being offered by the ascendancy in Yugoslavia of their fellow national, Tito; but it is the opinion of some who know them well that, if Tito turns out in the end to be more Communist, or more Russian, than Croatian, the tide of feeling will turn against him. If the nationalist motive ceased to operate, fear of Communism and of Russia would supervene, welling from the Roman Catholic culture of

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

SECRET

NUMBER 215

— 5 —

25 OCTOBER 1944

the Croats, their economic tradition as fairly well-off peasants, and their long association with the West.

The political forces indicated in the outline above sometimes operate in multiple. The bulk of Hungarian-Americans, for example, is repelled from Russia first by fear of Communism and then on top of that by nationalism. Whereas for their South Slavic neighbors the blood community with Russia is an emollient on the doctrinal or political galls which they may feel, the Hungarians, like the Germans, find almost intolerably humiliating the thought of domination by a congeries of people they deem to be culturally much less forward than themselves.

The doubling up of motivation may be observed also among Ukrainian-Americans. Perhaps the most vituperative anti-Soviet editorializing to be found in the foreign-language press has occurred in two Ukrainian-language newspapers (*Ameryka* of Philadelphia and *Svoboda* of Jersey City) under Uniate Catholic clerical influence. Catholic dislike of Communism combines with nationalist resentment over Russian dominion.

(b) *Revolutionary Affinity.* It is hardly surprising that in the current era of breaking up and re-making, great numbers of people and much agitation should come indiscriminately under the designations "Communist" and "Communism." The variegated elements which compose the popular body in each such situation are not Communists in the Party sense, or for the most part even fellow travelers. They are revolutionaries in their own place and right and follow the day's "party line" only so far as they are led thereto, unwittingly perhaps on their part, by Party Communists who have infiltrated into their leadership.

Mostly, one surmises, they are youngsters who, judging the past barren, have set their hearts, boldly if no more than gropingly, on achieving something new. The gravitation toward Russia is natural and strong, because the Russian Revolution is the most recent of the great revolutions and to many appears to have succeeded magnificently. Former liberals are attracted because democracy and liberalism appear, on the other hand, to have weakened in their powers of initiation and propulsion. But this "revolutionary" type of pro-Russian inclination is plainly a good deal less unquestioning and dependable than that of the disciplined Party Communists and fellow travelers.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

SECRET

NUMBER 215

— 6 —

25 OCTOBER 1944

*Reflections in
the United States*

Situations of the type described are to be found in their prime vigor only in war-torn Europe — in France, Italy, Yugoslavia, and Greece, for example. They have, however, their reflections here in the United States.

Among Italian-Americans disciplined Communism is represented by Ambrozio Donini and Giuseppe Berti, of the editorial staff of the *Unita del Popolo*. One can doubt that the number of other disciplined Communists is very considerable in relation to the total six million of the Italian-American community, but the influence of Russia in the revolutionary sense which has just been described is unmistakable and widespread. The motherland of Italy has undergone calamity; the past must have been wrong; there can be hope only in the new; Russia represents the new — this seems to be the order of thought. Even in the editorial columns of the once pro-Fascist *Progresso Italo-Americano* there is unblushing obeisance toward Russia as the seer and doer. Respect for power, which will be discussed later on, is no doubt an added factor in this as well as other cases.

A situation analogous to that among Italian-Americans is found among Greek-Americans; and a ferment of the same revolutionary type is very noticeably at work among Hungarian-Americans.

Hungarian Revolutionary Ferment

The main body of Hungarian-Americans, as represented by the American Hungarian Federation, still stands, along with the German-Americans, as uncompromising foes of Russia. A substantial minority, on the other hand, possessing greater powers of adaptability, recognizes some sort of economic and social revolution in Hungary to be the first necessary step toward a healthy Hungary in the future; and they are the more ready to work with Communists toward this end, despite unhappy memories of Bela Kun, because it is also plain to them that collaboration with Hungary's Slavic neighbors, including Soviet Russia, is prerequisite to Hungarian security and independence.

The evidence of this may be seen in an augmenting rally around Count Michael Karolyi, president of the Hungarian Republic of 1918-19 and present head of the Communist-tinctured Hungarian National Council in London. The rally began last April, when several different Hungarian-American factions on the Left temporarily united behind Karolyi in a single "roof" organi-

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

SECRET

NUMBER 215

— 7 —

25 OCTOBER 1944

zation.* Acting on recent advice from Karolyi, the Leftist leaders are now canvassing the possibility of a permanent over-all organization to function as an American affiliate of the London Council.

"Communism" of the type exemplified by the mild and eccentric Karolyi may join hands with temperate reform. So a former Hungarian diplomat now in Washington, Anthony Balasy — intelligent, open-minded, and devoted, but far from leftist — has responded with a qualified affirmative to a request by Karolyi to join up with him. Balasy has formulated a program designed to draw together, as a broad working, anti-Nazi coalition outside of Hungary, the self-designated committee of formerly loyal but now dissident Hungarian ministers plenipotentiary in neutral countries and Karolyi's "Communitistic" National Council.

II. NATIONALISM

(a) *Russian Patriotism.* The positive pull of Russian patriotism has been brilliantly demonstrated in the reconciliation to a victorious Soviet Russia of the anti-Bolshevik Russian exiles in the United States. The story was told at length in FN Number 211 of 13 September 1944, "Russian Nationalism Re-aligns the Anti-Bolshevik Russians." Pride in the achievements of the Soviets has filled Social Democrats, Social Revolutionaries, and "Cadets" with a patriotic fervor exceeded only by that of former Czarist aristocrats. Diametrical opposition to Moscow continues only among some unyielding champions of principle on the Left and a small residue of die-hard "White Guardists" on the Right. The trend was illuminated recently by a debate in the Russian-American press touched off by an article in which Alexander Kerensky had approved Soviet territorial demands. A climax befell when greetings were sent to the fourteenth convention of the Communist-line International Workers Order by a glittering array of ex-Czarists, and Prince Poutiatine appeared there personally to hail the Red Army as "the guardian of the tradition of Russian arms."

(b) *Slavism.* The broader cohesion of the community of all Slavs is an ever recurrent force in the complex relations of Russia and the European peoples and their offspring in the United States. In some cases — the Germans, the Hungarians, the Balts and the Swedes — the force is strongly *negative*.

* See "The Hungarian-American Left Regroups Behind Karolyi," FN Number B-202 of 2 June 1944.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

SECRET

NUMBER 215

— 8 —

25 OCTOBER 1944

German-, Hungarian-, and Lithuanian-Americans are just as passionately predisposed against the Slavic or Russian in international politics as were their forebears in Europe who saw themselves as wardens of the Eastern marches against the Slavic hordes.

The *positive* operation of the Slavic bond is best demonstrated in the case of the Carpatho-Russians. These poor mountain people, under Hungarian dominion until 1918, discovered only after many of them had migrated to the United States how closely related they were to the Ukrainians and Russians. Presumably they would have preferred to join up with Russia in 1918, but Russia was then cast down in defeat and revolution. They went in with the Czechoslovaks *faute de mieux*. Now that Russia has arisen from the ashes in phoenix-like glory, sentiment in the Carpatho-Russian-American community has become almost solid for inclusion of the homeland in the Soviet Union. A pro-Russian congress held by the Orthodox League for the Liberation of Red Carpatho-Russia in Philadelphia early in October marked only the latest maneuver in a long and loud agitation toward this end.

The interesting thing is the irrepressible elan of this pro-Russian drive among the Carpatho-Russians of the United States. It appears to have been promoted by the Orthodox clergy, who look now to Russia as the Uniate clergy (who share the Carpatho-Russian pastorate) look toward Rome. The agitation was heartily supported for a long time by the Communist-line daily *Karpatska Rus'* of Yonkers. However, after the USSR signed the Czechoslovak alliance, *Karpatska Rus'* and other Communist mentors began to admonish the Carpatho-Russian-American community not, at this time, to bear so urgently on the idea of a transfer of allegiance from Czechoslovakia to Russia. But the positive pull of Slavism, intensified by the new Russian prestige, has left these admonitions unheeded.

The Serb-Americans present a tragic contradiction. They are strongly drawn to Russia by the Slavic tie. They are repelled by Communism. Serbia in Europe was a chief and very hospitable refuge for the Russian refugees from Communism. How the Serb-American community is being pulled this way and that by all the forces which flow from the new Russian dynamism, and the turbulence as well of power politics in the Balkans—and how the Croatian- and Slovenian-Americans are likewise beset—was recently set forth at length by this Branch in its Number 212 of 21 September 1944, "Opposition to Tito, Actual and Potential."

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

SECRET

NUMBER 215

— 9 —

25 OCTOBER 1944

III. POWER POLITICS

(a) *Recognition of Force Majeure.* The current aphorism that "You can't be anti-Russian" stems in part from a generous enthusiasm for Russian gallantry—from gratitude to the Russian people for "tearing out the life of the German military monster." It rests in part on recognition of a hard fact. The fact is Russian power.

The outspoken Deputy Prime Minister of the Czechoslovak Government-in-Exile, Jan Masaryk, made it plain enough during his last visit to the United States that it was this kind of horse sense which mainly dictated the Benes policy of early accommodation with Russia. Czech-Americans, with very few notable exceptions, have gone along with the Benes policy, as have also those Slovak-Americans—a substantial minority—who work through the Czechoslovak National Council.

In adopting the Russian orientation so promptly and completely the Czechoslovak Government-in-Exile turned away from the earlier idea of confederation with Poland—that is, with the Poland of the Polish Government-in-Exile, which has in the main commanded the respect and support of Polish-Americans. That in itself was detrimental to good feeling between Czech and Polish elements in the United States; and Polish sensibilities have not been assuaged by inescapable and mounting recognition of the need to make now the accommodation for which Benes earlier set the pattern.

Mourners of the Fact The Polish-Americans do not find themselves alone in their state of unhappy compulsion. They have fellow sufferers in the Lithuanian- and other Baltic-Americans, and the Finnish-Americans. Emotionally, it may be said in each of these cases, the fear and distrust of Russia are as profound, possibly more so, than ever in the past. A Lithuanian-American Information Center in New York still pleads the cause of Baltic independence and puts out a spate of anti-Soviet atrocity stories. The executive committee of the Polish American Congress, whose principal members have fostered what is probably the most unbridled and vitriolic public attack ever made in the United States against a friendly foreign Power, restated their case to the President of the United States during a call at the White House 11 October 1944, the anniversary of Pulaski's death.

The perception of reality has, however, been by no means absent and seems latterly to be taking firmer hold. The bulk of the Polish-American community,

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

SECRET

NUMBER 215

— 10 —

25 OCTOBER 1944

and a large number as well of Polish refugees and officials in the United States, earlier supported Sikorski, and now give increasing support to Mikolajczyk, in the effort to effect a settlement and *modus vivendi* with Russia. It is deemed likely that, if an accommodation is come to officially, the anti-Soviet die-hard remnant will be found to be but a small fraction of the three million or more Americans of Polish background. A definite split has occurred within the Catholic Church leadership, which exercises so strong an influence on the Polish-American community; what appears to be the more numerous side is favoring a "reasonable" settlement of the dispute with Russia.

*Negative Effects
of Power*

Recognition of *force majeure* has its *negative* as well as positive effects. Naturally these are most noticeable among nationalities at a distance from Russia. Spanish Republican exiles are cooled in their attitude toward Russia by recollections of the arrogant use of Communist (i.e., Russian) power in Spain during the civil war and intervention. Spanish Socialists and Anarchists give signs of viewing Russia as a great and threatening Power which, from their viewpoint, is more akin to Germany than, say, Great Britain. The movement toward federation or quasi-federation in Western Europe under French leadership is partly motivated by the fear of Russian domination on the Continent.

(b) *The Balance of Power.* Considerations of the balance of power have commended a re-born Russia to the favorable thought of not a few groups which feel their homelands to have been too much at the mercy of British influence or American influence or "Anglo-Saxon" influence.

Russia as a Great Power once more has fitted with particular precision into the established mode of French political thinking. To those Frenchmen who remember the old device of the Eastern balance, first used in the sixteenth century by Francis I and applied to Russia by the Alliance of 1894, the Russian renaissance has seemed a veritable, if still unproven, God-send. The more exasperating have the British and American policies of reserve toward De Gaulle been felt to be, the more French thought has veered toward Russia as a counter-weight.

Yet experience so far has been equivocal and the hopes of a year or so ago have been somewhat dampened by detailed events. After Bretton Woods a French official complained to this Branch of Russian non-cooperativeness. The French, he said, made repeated efforts there to work jointly with the Russians, whose help they needed for the formation of a European bloc as against

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

SECRET

NUMBER 215

— 11 —

25 OCTOBER 1944

Great Britain with her empire and the United States with Latin America. Russia, however, consistently refused to work out any joint program or even to vote jointly with the French on specific questions, he said. Later, however, at the UNRRA conference in Montreal, according to the same official, the Russian attitude was more helpful.

Then too, Russia presents herself as counterweight only in political and military terms. Those of the French who have been concerned here with economic questions, such as Jean Monnet and Herve Alphand, appear to look away from Russia and toward the United States, not because they fear Russia's coming political role, but because of the economic assistance which France will need and which they think the United States alone can provide.

*Russia as
Counterbalance
in Italy*

As disappointment mounted in the Italian-American community respecting the Allied handling of reconquered Italy the tendency to look to Russia for counterbalance automatically increased. The conviction was widely expressed that Allied procedure in Italy was driving the Italian-American masses to the Left. The Russo-Italian exchange of diplomatic representatives last spring, though it drew denunciations of Russia from some liberals, was greeted by most as giving Italy sorely needed prestige. Russian treatment of Rumania has increased expressions of resentment over Allied treatment of Italy; the *Progresso Italo-Americano* of New York has been only one among numerous papers to suggest that for justice and generosity Italy might be forced to turn to Moscow.

Relative tolerance of Russia has also resulted from the hope that Soviet power might block supposed British designs on Italy. The view that Italy's salvation would issue from a struggle between Russia and Britain for domination in the Mediterranean is heard on many sides, including some of the most die-hard of the once pro-Fascist papers.

*The Greeks
and the Arabs*

The liberal republican element among Greek-Americans, believing the Greek people mostly immune to Communist doctrine and having little fear of Pan-Slavism, welcome Russian interest in the Eastern Mediterranean as a potent factor in countervailing British influence and especially what they deemed to be British interference in Greece's internal affairs.

Arab-Americans have recently become seriously interested in Soviet Russia and her post-war intentions. Russian recognition of Lebanese and Syrian

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

SECRET

NUMBER 215

— 12 —

25 OCTOBER 1944

independence was welcomed as a momentous event not only by spokesmen of the separatist Lebanese Maronites, but by Orthodox and Moslem federationists as well.

The separatist Maronites, traditionally pro-French and suspicious of British designs, plainly count on Russia to act as a stabilizing factor in Lebanese affairs, preventing Lebanon's encompassment in a British sphere of influence and permitting a French foothold, in some manner at least, to be maintained.

Pro-federationist Orthodox and Moslems who are predominantly anti-French, also wish Russia to play a larger role than heretofore in the Near East. Orthodox Christians in the Arab-American community, and no doubt in the homelands, have now become openly pro-Russian. This does not mean that they have espoused Soviet Communist doctrine. It is only an expression of their desire to find real help to offset British and French aims at ascendancy, since, in the words of one Arab-American, Soviet Russian imperialism is feared less than the imperialism of Great Britain and France.

Anti-Russianism
"Frankly Idiotic"

Hardheaded thinking of the sort exemplified by the citations given above with reference alike to *force majeure* and the balance of power has had its effect among the German Social Democratic refugees. The German-American community, as distinguished from the refugees, can indulge its emotional repugnance to Russia in comfort and safety, but refugees who hope some day to re-enter Germany face a difficult decision. The greater number of the Social Democratic refugees, hardened by their experiences with the Communists during the 'twenties and 'thirties, are still unyielding, but some have accepted the challenge of the facts.

For example, Siegfried Aufhaeuser, a sturdy trade unionist, joined the Council for a Democratic Germany, which includes some undoubted Communists. Though he has been disappointed by his experience in that committee, he tells this Branch that he is going to stick to his policy of "balance between East and West." Aufhaeuser ridicules his fellow party members—Stampfer, Seger, and Katz—who cleave to the anti-Russian line. "It is," he says, "frankly idiotic." "I would never sell out to the Russians," he says further, "but we have to realize that a hostile policy toward them will be futile. We must be friendly with both the Western Allies and Russia. Hope for an early clash of Russian and Western interests, which the Stampfer group, inspired by Ruth Fischer, seems

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

SECRET

NUMBER 215

— 13 —

25 OCTOBER 1944

to foster, is illusory. The grand alliance will not be given up, or at least not in the next fifteen or twenty years. The difficulties existing between Russia and the United States are minimal. Russia and Britain will find a solution for their clashes of opinion and interest."

(c) *Deus ex Machina*. Finally, Russia has come to be cast as *deus ex machina* in the wishful dramatizing of the downcast, bereft of hope in other quarters.

Serb-American nationalists, for example, felt—as the fortunes of the Croatian Tito waxed—that their nation was being cheated of support owing from Great Britain and the United States for the Serbian turn against the Axis in 1941. As the cause of their champion, General Draza Mihailovich, sank into desperation, they took comfort for a while in the vain thought that Soviet Russia would lift him up again. After all Russia did as much—and as unexpectedly—for Badoglio.

Similarly, contemplation of Russia's new power and readiness for quick action seems to have converted the last Armenian-American. Until July 1944 the Tashnag Party (Armenian Revolutionary Federation) was consistently and deeply anti-Soviet. Then, motivated in part by the promise of greater autonomy implicit in the recent constitutional change in the USSR and in part by a hope that the USSR could be induced to annex to Soviet Armenia the Armenian provinces of Turkey, it officially joined all the other Armenian-American organizations in expressing friendship for the Soviets.

Russia, Rescuer of the Slovaks? The hope of *deus ex machina* appears to be affecting also those Slovak-Americans who support the Hodza program of autonomy or "self-existence" (*samobytnost*) for Slovakia within a reconstituted "Czecho-Slovak Republic." Many among them are Roman Catholic. Nearly all have been until recently—consonant with the position their patron Hodza maintained—strongly against Benes' Russian alliance, considering Russia to be equally dangerous with Germany.

Since the Soviet-Czechoslovak Pact was signed, however, these Slovak-Americans have watched with deep interest a growing pressure from Slovak Communist quarters upon the Czechoslovak Government-in-Exile in favor of full autonomy for Slovakia within the reconstituted Republic. Judging this advocacy of full Slovak autonomy to be the adoption, in effect, of Hodza's program, the Slovak-American autonomists have responded by actively cooperat-

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

SECRET

NUMBER 215

— 14 —

25 OCTOBER 1944

ing with the left-wingers. Since the Slovak Communists are presumed to be in tune with Moscow, the followers of Hodza easily convince themselves that Moscow intends to give their own cherished program practical effect.

Zionists too have seen new hope in the new Russia. Zionist circles in New York have recently buzzed with rumors that Stalin would soon issue a statement backing Zionist aims in Palestine and granting permission to raise funds in Russia for the upbuilding of Palestine. The New York Yiddish-language *Day* now defends almost all actions of the Soviet, as does also to a lesser extent the *Morning Journal*, under the same ownership.

Skeptics point out that Zionism and the Hebrew language continue under ban in Russia and that Moscow has yet to indicate any distaste for the British White Paper. Nevertheless Russia remains in the minds of many Zionists the new and unpredictable champion; everyone knows already in advance approximately what the plodding democracies will do.

*Russian Opportun-
ism Also Feared*

The seeming opportunism of recent Russian policy operates also in the *negative* direction. It engenders misgiving and fear along with hope and so repels as well as attracts. The Rumanian-American community does not, for the most part, relish current suggestions that the Soviets may re-enthroned Carol in Bucharest. Predictions of a Habsburg restoration under Russian power, however silly they may seem, still stir a vague uneasiness. *Espana Libre*, a mildly Socialist paper of New York, is given to apprehensions over Stalin coming to terms with Franco and opines that Russian Communists really behave no differently from the English monarchists.

If the new Russia turns out to be just another Great Power with the accustomed admixtures of sordidness and brutality, hopes will be shattered in numerous quarters and bitterness engendered; but there will still be an advantage from the viewpoint of the smaller Powers and the under-dog nationalities—and most, be it noted, of our foreign nationality groups in the United States derive from the smaller Powers and the under-dog nationalities. There will still be the advantage of having three Great Powers instead of only two, and the third somehow different—perhaps. Safety for the small fry appears to increase with a multiplication of the big, because the latter may, sometimes, neutralize each other. The most threatening development in this tumultuous

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

SECRET

NUMBER 215

— 15 —

25 OCTOBER 1944

epoch, as it seems to the minorities, is the concentration of power in so few places.

*An Unprecedented
Experience.*

Not only has there not been in modern history so simple a pointing up of power as the present; seldom, if ever before, has it occurred that a Great Power has burst into greatness so suddenly as the new Russia. Inevitably the Russian Government and people are in some respects imperfectly prepared for their new role. By the same token other nations are imperfectly prepared to meet the new situation on their side also. Political thought is in some part unripe and political attitudes are frequently bewildered and unstable. The situation is of necessity fluid.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

FOREIGN NATIONALITY GROUPS IN THE UNITED STATES
MEMORANDUM TO THE DIRECTOR OF STRATEGIC SERVICES
FROM THE FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

Number B-267

30 October 1944

THE NEW BULLETIN RUSSIAN AFFAIRS

The erroneous ascription of official Soviet imprimatur to a new (and actually anti-Soviet) bulletin on Russian affairs has stirred the Communist-line *Russky Golos* to a general defense of Soviet policies. The new bulletin, sponsored by a Social Democratic group and privately financed, has received the enthusiastic support of the anti-Soviet Lithuanian American Council.

A NEW and privately financed information bulletin, *Russian Affairs*, was brought to the attention of a wider public by a Washington dispatch in the *New York Times*, 18 October, which attributed the publication to Soviet quarters. Both the bulletin and the *Times* were immediately denounced by the Communist press, in particular by the New York *Russky Golos* 19 October. At the same time the Soviet Embassy disclaimed any connection with the new publication, following which the *Times* printed a retraction.

Russian Affairs is an eight-page publication corresponding in format to the Information Bulletin of the Soviet Embassy. Introductory remarks in the first issue distinguish between:

...two rival propagandas concerning the Soviet Union. One lacks all sympathy with the aspirations of the Russian people and believes that collaboration with Russia is impossible. The other insists that such collaboration requires a blind subordination of American interests and an indiscriminate glorification of everything Russian.

30 OCTOBER 1944

The new bulletin is apparently designed to strike a happy medium between these two lines of approach. To the suspicious eye the heading of the first article, "The Warsaw Uprising," would however seem to indicate incomplete success in this endeavor. Subsequent articles on the "Promotion of Large Families" and on "Livestock in the Devastated Areas" come nearer to it. But a substantial part of the publication is made up of items of a different kind. In addition to an article on "Germany and Russia," quoting at length Marshal Stalin's statement on a strong Germany of 6 November 1942, there is an article on the "Deportation of Lithuanians" based on material supplied by the anti-Soviet Lithuanian American Information Center; an article critical of the freedom of the "Russian Trade Unions"; and also critical "Notes" on "The Building Work of the NVKD" [successor to the GPU], the "Fate of the Jew in Russia," "Soviet Scholarship," and "Light on the [Russian] Purges."

*Lithuanian-
American
Collaboration*

The suspicion of a bias is further confirmed by the executive secretary of the Lithuanian American Council, Dr. Pius Grigaitis. In talking with a friend of this Branch, Grigaitis spoke of the good impression left upon him and other Lithuanian delegates at the convention of the Council in New York on 17 and 18 October by the appearance of "pro-Lithuanian and anti-Soviet" material in the first issue of *Russian Affairs*. He said that the material was prepared with the help of the Information Bureau of the Council and asserted: "This publication is going places. While the first issue was published to the tune of 35,000 copies, the second issue is planned to have a run of 50,000."

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

30 OCTOBER 1948

Sponsorship

The publication is issued in the name of the Institute for Russian Studies of the Rand School of Social Science, 7 East 15th Street, New York, organized by Bertram D. Wolfe, a member of the Social Democratic Federation, and by two members of the right wing of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, George Denicke and Solomon Schwarz. This Branch learns, however, that the publication is financed by a private source. The name can be furnished on request.

*Russky Golos
vs. the Times*

The *Times* story regarding *Russian Affairs* on 18 October had stated that the publication was "made available through the Soviet Embassy." Excerpts from the article on "Russia and Germany" purporting to present authentic Soviet views on the treatment of Germany, the organization of German prisoners in Russia, and the members of the League of German Officers in Russia, strengthened the impression made also by the *Times* headlines that the periodical in effect was a Soviet publication.

Noting that "with pre-knowledge or through a misunderstanding" the *Times* was "advertising" the new publication, and contending that the Institute for Russian Studies should not pretend to impartiality, the *Russky Golos*, 19 October, branded *Russian Affairs* as an "English version of *Socialistichesky Vestnik*" which protects such "wreckers" and "reptiles" as the Russian Social Democrat Abramovitch, and, like the monarchist *Rosslyn*, seeks to undermine American-Soviet friendship.

This *Socialistichesky Vestnik* [continued the *Russky Golos*] in the English language diligently defends the interests of the London Polish "government" and the remnants of the Lithuanian fascist regime, it libels the CIO for its genuine desire to collaborate with the Soviet Union and with the trade unions of the USSR and it supports the leaders of the AFL in their rejection of such collaboration.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

30 OCTOBER 1944

To round out the picture let us add that in *Russian Affairs* one can also find something about "the terrors of the GPU," an accusation against the Soviet government that it conceals from Soviet citizens the fact of mass extermination of Jews by the Germans, transparent hints that the Soviet Union is for a 'soft peace' and forgiveness of the crimes of some of the German officers who belong to the Bund Deutscher Offiziere in the USSR, as well as the brazen lie that Marshal Stalin is 'against the demilitarization of Germany.'

If this is not enough to expose the falsity of the pretension of *Russian Affairs* that it desires collaboration between the USA and the USSR, we can add that the bulletin declares that it obtains the "truth" about the Soviet Union from its own sources and it recommends to Americans to read the book of Chernavin -- collaborator of the New York paper *Rossiia* which praised Hitler and fascism before Pearl Harbor -- in order to get acquainted with conditions in the USSR.

Rossiia has also undertaken the issuance of an English journal offering "truth" about the Soviet Union. Despite the difference in the political physiognomies of Rybacoff and Abramovitch, their most immediate aim is the same -- to break up the growing collaboration between the USA and the USSR.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Act, 50 U.S.C. 31 and 32, as amended. Its transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

COPY
68

FOREIGN NATIONALITY GROUPS STATES
MEMORANDUM TO THE DIRECTOR OF STRATEGIC SERVICES
FROM THE FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

Number B-268

31 October 1944

action in U.S.
CARPATHO-RUSSIAN LIBERATION CONGRESS.

The long agitation among Carpatho-Russian-Americans for union of Czechoslovakia's easternmost province with the USSR found its most recent expression at a Congress in Philadelphia 8-9 October called by the Russophile but non-Communist League for the Liberation of Red-Carpatho-Russia. Attended by the leading figures of the Russian Orthodox clergy, the Congress set up a permanent body and made clear its view that the mountainous Carpathian homeland -- strategically important as a sally port from East to West -- belonged with Slavic Russia regardless of the desires of the Czechs, the Ukrainians, or even the Soviet leaders themselves.

MEETING in Philadelphia 8-9 October on the eve of the Red Army's thrust across Sub-Carpathian Russia (Ruthenia), the All-National Liberation Congress of Americans of Russian and Carpatho-Russian Descent focused attention once more on the manifold strategic, historical, and ethnic problems wrapped up in pre-war Czechoslovakia's easternmost province. The Congress served notice once again that Carpatho-Russians, who are almost as numerous in the United States as in the homeland, are determined to see the mountainous, sparsely populated region, now wrested from Magyar control for the second time in twenty-five years, united

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

with Russia — despite the Czechs, in defiance of Ukrainian nationalism, and regardless, it might be, even of the Kremlin itself. Address after address demanded that not only Sub-Carpathian Russia but the Lemko region and other neighboring areas west of the Curzon Line and south of the Carpathians, be taken into the USSR. Resolutions to this effect were communicated to President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Marshal Stalin, and an organization to be known as the American Russian and Carpatho-Russian League, with headquarters in Philadelphia, was created by the Congress as a permanent body.

*Carpatho-Russia:
Key to Soviet
Intentions?*

In previous memoranda* this Branch has pointed out the strategic possibilities bound up with control of Sub-Carpathian Russia, commanding as it does the upper reaches of the Theiss River, and encompassing within its strategic orbit the Danube Basin — Budapest, Vienna, and Prague.

It will be recalled that the irrepressible pro-Russian agitation among the Carpatho-Russians in the United States has not received recognition or support in Moscow, though it was originally instigated and until a while ago was vigorously abetted by the otherwise Communist-line *Karpatska Rus'* of Yonkers, organ of the Lemko Association. Michael Logoyda of the Association and Simeon Pysh, editor of *Karpatska Rus'*, were present at the Philadelphia Congress but (in keeping with their recent apparent intention to avoid embarrassing the USSR vis-a-vis Czechoslovakia by continuing the

* See "Whither Carpatho-Russia?," FN Number B-194 of 5 May 1944.
Also "Carpatho-Russia, Clue to Soviet Policy? Chapter III,"
FN Number B-155 of 10 February 1944.

union-with-Russia thesis) made it clear that they were present only as observers and that the Lemko Association was not participating.

No one can know at present how the five or six hundred thousand Carpatho-Russians who remain in the homeland would vote if they had a present opportunity to decide their future allegiance, but it is a fair assumption that they would be deeply influenced by a sense of Slav kinship and by Russia's new glory. The nearly equal number of Carpatho-Russians in the United States were given an opportunity to express their wishes in 1919 on the fate of the homeland, and, it will be recalled, voted in favor of union with the Czechoslovak Republic. But in 1919 Russia was cast down in defeat. Indications are unmistakable that given a chance to vote again in the near future on the same question the people would be overwhelmingly in favor of union with the USSR. Like a good many Slovaks, the Carpatho-Russians here as well as abroad were adversely influenced in the between-wars period by resentment over what they called "Czech centralism."

*Background of
the Congress*

The Congress, which assembled in the Benjamin Franklin Hotel in Philadelphia, had been in preparation for almost two years by the League for Liberation of Red-Carpatho-Russia, a political instrument of the Russian Brotherhood Organization (ORB). The ORB, a fraternal society which has some 16,000 members including Lemkos as well as Carpatho-Russians, both Greek Catholic and Orthodox, organized the political League in 1942 to help achieve "the liberation and unification," on the basis of self-determination, of Sub-Carpathian Russia with what it called significantly "Imperial Russia, today the Soviet Union." The ORB's motivation seems to have been a desire to counteract the Communist influence of the American Carpatho-Russian Congress. Support was looked for and found

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

among the conservative elements of the Greek Catholic and Orthodox churches and fraternal organizations.

This initiative was responsible for the character of the Philadelphia meeting. The 250 delegates included only a few Carpatho-Russian-Americans actually stemming from Carpatho-Russia. Some were present who had been immigrants from the eastern regions of Galicia and Volhynia. But the great majority were delegates from local lodges of the ORB whose backbone is made up of Galician Lemkos. The last named — immigrants from old Austria-Hungary who had been in the stream of the Russophile movement in that empire at the turn of the century — were now clearly transferring their former worship of the Russia of the Czars into patriotic worship of Stalin's Russia in its resurgent glory. And today as then the Russian Orthodox Church was in the vanguard. Metropolitan Benjamin of the Russian Orthodox Patriarchal Church and Archbishop Adam Philippovsky of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese were at the Philadelphia gathering, and greetings were sent to the Patriarch Alexis in Moscow.

*The Congress and
the Soviet Union*

The Congress was called to order by Mighael Holod, president of the ORB and the Liberation League. The

Reverend Roman Samilo of Chester, Pennsylvania, delivered the keynote address. He pointed out that after the first World War many Russian lands, including Red- and Carpatho-Russia were not liberated — because Russia was not present at the peace conference. Today Soviet Russia was the strongest force in world politics:

We ask and demand that Russian lands west of the Curzon Line and south of the Carpathian Mountains be united with the Soviet Union.... This is a war of liberation which should bring liberty to all subjugated peoples. The population of the Lemko territory, the Priashev region

31 OCTOBER 1944

and Carpatho-Russia represents one people which should not remain divided. Chelm and the Yaroslav region west of the Curzon Line are historically Russian lands -- all these territories should be united with the Soviet Union.... The Congress will demand that the population of these territories should decide about their allegiance through a plebiscite.

Archbishop Adam Philippovsky of the Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese denied in his address that the Congress was betraying Russia to the Bolsheviks. "No one can say that we betrayed Russia and became Bolsheviks. We greeted with the same enthusiasm the Russian Czar when in 1914 he proclaimed at Lwow the unification of all Russian lands." With greater enthusiasm, Samilo had already referred to the Soviet Premier as "our Stalin", and recited the Soviet anthem which, he said, "the Carpatho-Russian Lemkos and other people not united with the Soviets are eager to sing...." Another speaker, the Reverend Joseph Fedorenko of Terryville, Connecticut, like Archbishop Philippovsky attempted to allay possible discomfort in the Congress's support of the Soviets. He implied that the Soviets were but a temporary form, referring to them as "the great Russian Empire, at present the Soviet Union."

An undertone of reproach against indiscriminate approval of Soviet policies was evident in the address of the Reverend John Kushvara of Yonkers, New York, who proposed that Carpatho-Russia should be established as a separate republic and not joined with any Soviet state. "We should pay no attention," he declared, "to whether this [union] would be welcomed by the Soviet Government or not. The main thing is that it should be acceptable to us. We should demand and hope that the Russian banner be posted over the Carpathians." The same speaker declared himself to be against use of the term "Red Army," suggesting that it be called the Russian Army. Reminding his hearers that

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

31 OCTOBER 1944

there was also an American army, he declared that if it were not for the American worker the Red Army would not be in the Carpathians. He concluded his speech by asking the audience to rise in silent prayer for the Carpatho-Russians in the American armed forces.

Victor Hladyk of the ORB had some bitter words for the present Soviet attitude toward the Carpatho-Russians. He noted that the Carpatho-Russians have no representative in the All-Slav Congress in Moscow "because Benes talked to Stalin and both agreed not to permit it." He also complained that he had been trying in vain for two months to obtain a visa to Moscow where he wanted to intervene on behalf of the Carpatho-Russians.*

Ukrainian Problem

The gulf between sentiment for the old Russia and appreciation of present realities was apparent in the treatment of the Ukrainian issue at the Congress. Remaining faithful to the old slogan "One Czar — One People" the elements represented at the Congress generally refuse to recognize the changes introduced by the nationality policy of the Soviets: they oppose all decentralization and they favor assimilation of Ukrainians, Byelorussians and other Soviet constituents with the Russians. Some of them still refuse to accept the name "Ukraine" and "Ukrainians" and regard it as treason to use these terms. Michael Logoyda, in reading greetings from the Carpatho-Russian National Committee of Yonkers mentioned the Ukrainians

* In this connection it has been learned by this Branch that Pavel Cibere, former Carpatho-Russian representative in the Czechoslovak State Council in London, is on his way to Moscow where his temporary address will be that of the All-Slav Committee. A persevering propagandist for Czechoslovak-Carpatho-Russian unity, and believed to be anti-Soviet, Cibere had been replaced in the Czechoslovak State Council by Ivan Petruscak, a "Ukrainian Communist." (See "Carpatho-Russia, Clue to Soviet Policy? Chapter III," FN Number B-155 of 10 February 1944.)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

and evoked a protest when he said: "I entertain no hostility toward the Ukrainians. I take off my hat to those Ukrainians who are fighting Nazism." A delegate rose to move that everything Logoyda said about the Ukrainians be stricken from the record. Another delegate made a motion which would forbid all mention of Ukrainians during the proceedings.

In this connection it is worth noting that the Russophile *Pravda*, Philadelphia organ of the ORB, on 27 October bitterly criticized a statement in the Communist-line *Ukrainski Shchodenni Visty* of 22 October that "Post-war Czechoslovakia will truly be a national state of Czechs, Slovaks, and Carpatho-Ukrainians." The Ukrainian paper, *Pravda* asserted, "does not speak for the Carpatho-Russian people."

No such division at the Congress was noticeable regarding *Czechoslounkin* Czechoslovakia. Attitudes were uniformly unfriendly. Metropolitan Benjamin noted, during his address, that the Carpatho-Russian population had not received fair and equal treatment at the hands of the Czechs. He expressed the view that Czechoslovakia would not be in a position to continue its pre-war policy. Victor Hladyk also struck an anti-Czech note. Severely criticizing the pre-war Czech regime in Sub-Carpathian-Russia he branded as traitors those Carpatho-Russians who follow the Czech orientation. "If the Czech were a real Slav," he asserted, "and if he had a Slav soul, he would not persecute the Russians in Carpatho-Russia.... We cannot allow Carpatho-Russia to return to Czech domination."

The Reverend Joseph Olas of Newark, New Jersey, pointed out that there were many Carpatho-Russians fighting against the Germans in the ranks of the Czechoslovak Brigade. "Today they fight," he said, "and tomorrow they will know how to maintain the liberty they achieve."

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

The New League A permanent organization to replace the Liberation League was set up by the Congress. As the American Russian and Carpatho-Russian League, the new organization will give moral and material aid to "subjugated Russian lands" and continue the political activities of its predecessor. If possible, the new League will publish its own journal, and in addition a book containing the texts of the addresses at the Congress. According to the plans made, the new organization will establish branches in Russian and Carpatho-Russian communities. Dues will be divided evenly between the central organization in Philadelphia and the branches.

Officers elected to lead the new League include the following: chairman, Jack Russin, an attorney from Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania; vice chairmen, Stephen Shkimba of Brooklyn, New York, and Theodore Shkirpan of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; secretaries, the Reverend Roman Samilo of Chester, Pennsylvania, and John Cap, an attorney from Philadelphia; treasurer, Nicholas Bubernak of the ORB. The advisory board consists of Michael Holod of the ORB, the Reverend Damian Krehel of Bayonne, New Jersey, Peter Lalush of Mayfield, Pennsylvania, Nicholas Bushko, of Frackville, Pennsylvania, Andrew Koblosh of Chicago, Illinois, and Nellie Plasko of Detroit, Michigan.

Presidents of organizations and heads of all Orthodox and Uniate Carpatho-Russian and Russian dioceses will be invited to serve as honorary chairmen of the organization. Editors of Carpatho-Russian- and Russian-language papers will also be invited to join.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

OFF
FN
This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Act, 50 U.S.C. 31 and 32, as amended. Its transmission or the revelation of its content in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

C O P Y

70

FOREIGN NATIONALITY GROUPS. STATES
MEMORANDUM TO THE DIRECTOR OF STRATEGIC SERVICES
FROM THE FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

Number B-287

1 December 1944

AGITATION FOR CARPATHO-RUSSIAN
PLEBISCITE RESUMED

*Fickler
folder*

With the liberation of the "Carpatho-Ukraine" by the Red Army, and the arrival of a Czechoslovak delegation there, agitation regarding the ultimate disposition of the small but highly strategic province has commenced anew in the Carpatho-Russian-American community. The Communist-led Lemko Association, once more in the forefront of this agitation, appears anxious not to offend the Soviet-allied Czechoslovak Government-in-Exile by demanding outright incorporation of the area in the USSR, limiting its campaign this time to advocacy of a plebiscite.

THE recently liberated province of Sub-Carpathian Russia, now designated as Carpatho-Ukraine by agreement between Moscow and the Czechoslovak Government in London, has once more become the subject of agitation among Carpatho-Russians in the United States. While Czechoslovak Minister Frantisek Nemec and his delegation have arrived in the provincial capital, Uzhhorod, from Moscow to take over civil administration, Carpatho-Russians here, spearheaded by the Communist-led Lemko Association, are laying plans to contest Czechoslovak sovereignty over the province and to demand for it self-determination by plebiscite.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

In 1919, it will be recalled, Carpatho-Russian-Americans had much to do with bringing about the incorporation of the major portion of this region in the Czechoslovak Republic. In the years that followed, dissatisfaction with the central government in Prague developed, and late in 1943 Sovietophile elements in the United States were joined by conservative Orthodox groups in agitation for the union of the province with Soviet Russia.* By this time, it was believed, a very large majority of Carpatho-Russian-Americans — who are almost as numerous as their kinsmen in the homeland — favored incorporation of the province in the USSR.

Agitation Resumed From 1938 until very recently, while Carpatho-Russia (Carpatho-Ukraine), remained under Magyar and later German occupation, Carpatho-Russians were mostly hesitant to raise the issue of the homeland's future allegiance, limiting themselves to press comment. During 1944 the Lemko Association and its Yonkers weekly, *Karpatska Rus**, apparently not to raise questions of good faith in respect to the Soviet-Czechoslovak accord, played down the question of the future status of Carpatho-Russia.** But today most groups seem to feel that the time has come again to oppose openly the restoration of Czechoslovak rule without a plebiscite. Recent news of the official Czechoslovak attitude is said to have contributed to the resurgence of a militant spirit. Efforts on the part of official Czechoslovaks to win the Carpatho-Russian-Americans to their position were resented. Furthermore, it was said, not until the Czechoslovak delegation led by Nemec passed through Moscow was a native "Carpatho-Russian" — Ivan Turjanica, an officer in the Czechoslovak Brigade — attached to the delegation.

* See "Carpatho-Russia, Clue to Soviet Policy? Chapters II and III," FN Numbers B-122 and B-155 of 6 December 1943 and 10 February 1944.

** See "Whither Carpatho-Russia?", FN Number N-194 of 5 May 1944.

Campaign Planned Foremost in bringing the issue of self-determination for Carpatho-Russia once more into the open is the leftist-controlled Lemko Association of Yonkers, New York. The Association plans in the immediate future to launch, under the sponsorship of the Sovietophile American Carpatho-Russian Congress, a campaign which will include mass meetings in Carpatho-Russian-American communities and the circulation of a mass petition for self-determination of Carpatho-Russia, signed by members of Carpatho-Russian parishes, societies, and organizations. It is anticipated that out of the meetings will come resolutions favoring a plebiscite, which, along with the mass petition, will then be forwarded to Washington, London, and Moscow.

The organizers of this campaign emphasize that their aim is not to initiate a plan for Carpatho-Russia's future status. They will, they say, simply limit themselves to insistence that the general principle of self-determination be applied. They would have no objection to the restoration of the pre-war status of Carpatho-Russia if such should be the free choice of the population expressed in a plebiscite.

*Masaryk's "Promise"
to Be Atred Anew*

In raising the issue again the group plans to exploit a statement of Jan Masaryk — said to have been made during an interview in New York with two representatives of the Lemko group 1 February 1944 and promptly repudiated by Czech officials here — which allegedly ran: "The Czechoslovak Government has in no way decided the future of Sub-Carpathian Russia. It is going to be decided by the people after the war." The Lemko group nonetheless seems intent on avoiding the appearance of hostility to the Czechs. By making no proposal for a solution for the future of Carpatho-Russia and by using the allegedly official Czechoslovak

statement as a working premise, they propose to demonstrate that their only concern is respect for the popular will in the old homeland.

In accordance with these plans *Karpatska Rus'* has published several articles emphasizing that the future of the homeland should be decided by the population there and that Carpatho-Russian-Americans should insist upon that. On 24 October the paper took issue both with the official Czechoslovak view with respect to the "Carpatho-Ukraine" and with the Polish view with respect to the Lemko territory. The editor wrote:

As for ourselves we can do one thing. We can organize a united people's front and embrace all within it for the defense of Carpatho-Russia's freedom. If we do this the Polish and Czech diplomats will be forced to disavow their pretensions to Carpatho-Russian territories. Their own masses will tell them that those who do not want to be within their states cannot be held by force.

The editor appealed for a systematic campaign for a plebiscite, and not just a one-day demonstration.

Referring directly to the liberation of Carpatho-Russia by the Red Army, *Karpatska Rus'* 3 November refused to accept the view that the Soviet Union would turn Carpatho-Russia over to the Czechoslovak Government-in-Exile. "The Russians bring them [the Carpatho-Russians] freedom...the people will decide their future themselves. It is not true that Russia will hand over our people to the Czechs."

Orthodox Church
Group Backs
the Campaign

In agreement with the Yonkers group are elements under the leadership of the Reverend Varzaly of the Carpatho-Russian Greek Orthodox Church of the Eastern Rite, whose official weekly *Visnyk* has followed an editorial policy similar to that of *Karpatska Rus'*. In its issue of 9 November the former paper published an appeal entitled "For the Full Freedom of Sub-Carpathian Russia," signed by John

1 DECEMBER 1944

Popp, vice president of the leftist-led American Carpatho-Russian Congress, in which Popp appealed to Carpatho-Russian-Americans to rally in defense of their homeland against "Czech centralists." "We must demand," he wrote, "full national and political freedom and the right of self-determination for our people in Carpatho-Russia, in accordance with the Atlantic Charter." Popp appealed to the chairman of the American Carpatho-Russian Congress to call the officers of that organization to a meeting and invite the participation of leaders of other benevolent, political, and cultural organizations. He expressed the hope that the united voice of Carpatho-Russian-Americans would be heard in Washington, Moscow, and London and that it would "bring an end to the illegal pretentions of the Czechs to dominate Carpatho-Russia."*

Whether or not the Orthodox, American Russian and Carpatho-Russian League of Philadelphia will cooperate in this campaign is considered doubtful by leaders of the Lemko group. The League is preparing plans of its own** and the Lemko Association is believed to be unwilling to become involved in any political collaboration with it because they regard the Philadelphia organization as politically undependable and representative of Galicia rather than the mountain valleys which are the old home for them.

* There is reason to believe that the piece was written by Dr. Alexis Gierowski, who with Popp and the Reverend John Yanchishin visited the Carpatho-Ukraine in 1938. See also "Alexis Gierowski and Carpatho-Russia," FN Number 197 of 26 June 1944.

** See "Carpatho-Russian Liberation Congress," FN Number B-268 of 31 October 1944.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
955
This document contains information
affecting the national defense
of the United States within
the meaning of the Espionage Act, 50
U.S.C. 31 and 32, as amended. Its
transmission or the revelation of
its contents in any manner to an
unauthorized person is prohibited
by law.

C O P Y

87

FOREIGN NATIONALITY GROUPS IN THE UNITED STATES
MEMORANDUM TO THE DIRECTOR OF STRATEGIC SERVICES
FROM THE FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

Number B-292

9 December 1944

THE "VICTORY CLUB" AND THE
DISPERSION OF RUSSIAN RIGHTISTS

Tickler

*Russian
re*

The return of the anti-Bolshevist Russian emigration to the Soviet Russian fold finds its most active expression just now in the Pobeda (Victory) Club of New York. At a recent typical gathering, held in honor of Yugoslavia, the once hostile emigres joined with Soviet officials and Russian-American Communists and fellow travelers in praising Stalin and Tito. Only a few dying or dormant anti-Bolshevist organizations remain.

As reported recently by this Branch,* the impulse of national pride since Soviet Russia became victorious has been moving more and more of those who fled to this country from the Revolution of twenty-five years ago to find a common tongue with those who rule Russia today. The trend had a concrete and interesting expression in the Pobeda (Victory) Club of New York. This club was organized not long ago by Captain Sergei M. Kournakoff, former officer of the "Wild Division" in the White Armies, and now military expert of the Communist-line Russky Golos. It is presided over by Prince A. M. Roubiatine.

* See "Russian Nationalism Realigns the Anti-Bolshevik Russians," FN Number 211 of 13 September.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

The club holds its meetings usually at a YMCA. Those who made up the Revolution's exodus to the United States -- a few former nobles and many professionals and others of the middle class -- foregather with Soviet officials and military men, Russian-American Communists and fellow travelers, and a salting from the leftist intelligentsia which otherwise still provides a few enduring Soviet opponents. There is sincere common rejoicing over the new glory of the Russian people and their Soviet state, the horrors of the past being explained by the emigration as a suffering and cleansing which has now moved Russia and the Russian people, ahead of the West, into the forefront of history's process.

*Pobeda's
Yugoslav
Banquet*

The latest Pobeda affair was a Russian-Yugoslav banquet, in celebration of the junction of the Red Army's forces with those of Marshal Tito, held in New York City 18 November. The hall was decorated with Soviet, Yugoslav and American flags and the guests of honor included Soviet Consul General E.D. Kisselev, the Yugoslav Consul Oscar Gavrilovich, the Soviet Vice Consul Mikhailov and representatives of the Red Army and Navy. Speeches were delivered by the chairman, Prince Poutiatine, by Sergei Kournakoff, by the French writer Pierre de Lanux, by James S. Cushman, chairman of the American Mayflower Society, by the radio commentators Mrs. Samuel Barlow and William Gailmor, and by Zlatko Balokovich, president of the United Committee of South-Slavic Americans. Over 120 people attended.

Opening the meeting, Prince Poutiatine pointed out the similarity of the historical missions of the different Slav peoples, who, he said, had saved Europe from conquest by the Mongols and Turks and were now saving

it from enslavement by the Germans. It was highly significant, the Prince concluded, that in those difficult days when the German Army stood at the gates of Moscow, Marshal Tito opened the first "Second Front" by launching Partisan activities against the German occupants.

Captain Kournakoff reminded his listeners of the operations of Generals Rokossovsky and Eremenko two years ago which led to the Stalingrad victory and developed into the subsequent offensive, culminating in the Red Army's joining forces with Tito on 30 September south of the Iron Gate. "From that moment on, a single uninterrupted front of the Red Army has stretched from Kirkenes to Trieste, from the Atlantic Ocean to the warm Adriatic."

The program was concluded by Zlatko Balokovich, who made a long and impassioned address concerning the tremendous sacrifices "made by all Slavs" in the present war, and "the indestructible force of united Slavdom" which was within reach of "final victory."

In addition to the regular members of the Club, the Communist-line IWO, the dissident Socialist Revolutionaries and the Social Register were represented.

II.

The war on native Russian soil, the victories of the Red Army, and the recent Soviet tenderness in regard to the Church and the family, have wrought surprising changes among the Russian-Americans of the Right. Some

*Present Complexion
of the Rightist
Emigration*

of the older rightists have reached the age of physical incapacity for leadership. Many of the younger element are in the armed forces. In their majority the remaining members of the White emigration fall into two main groups: one which accepts the Soviet Union without

reservation; and one which, though still strongly anti-Communist, perceives some good in the present Government of Russia and hopes or believes that the Communist regime is evolving into a strictly Russian national state. Among the first group are the one-time "Whites" who frequent the Pobeda Club. The second group is represented primarily by the Association of Officers and Men Formerly of the Russian Army, formed in New York City in 1941, and the Czarists of the San Francisco daily *Russkaya Zhizn*.

The thinning of rightist ranks becomes particularly noticeable upon inquiry into the present status of the organizations which flourished before the war in the Russian-American community. The Russian-American National Committee of New York City, originally set up with the active assistance of "leftovers" from Czarist missions and embassies for the purpose of acting as an official representative of all the "White" Russian elements in America and possibly abroad, lost its chief *raison d'être* with America's recognition of the USSR. Comprising practically every articulate Russian anti-Communist, the Committee declared its dedication to the fight on Communism. It was last publicly heard from in July 1941, when, in a memorandum signed by Boris Brasol, Archbishop Vitaly and the noted aviator Boris Sergievsky, it took a stand in favor of utilizing the German attack to free Russia from the Soviet regime.

*Other White
Russian Groups*

Also dormant or extinct is the so-called "United Russian National Organizations in America," an offshoot of the National Committee, which besides Brasol counted among its leaders the noted aircraft designer Igor Sikorsky and Prince Paul Chavchavadze, and which at one time had active committees in Washington, San Francisco, Seattle and Detroit.

The Mladorossy (or members of the League of Young Russians) whose program aimed at a synthesis of Czardom and Soviets, were disbanded in 1941

by their world leader, Alexander L. Kasem-Beg, who has become thoroughly pro-Soviet.

Most of the Impertsy (or members of the Russian Imperial Union, led by Kropotkin, Glovacheff, Melnikoff and Savelkoff, and publishing from time to time Russkaya Pravda Impertsev) are now in the armed forces of the United States, so that practically all activities are suspended.)

News appears in Russian-language papers from time to time concerning the activities of still smaller groups. One of these is the All-Russian National Peasant Alliance, headed by S. Latchenko and A. Staaken. Another is the Brigadier-General John V. Turchin Garrison 297, an association of ex-White officers and their families, headed by the aviator Boris Sergievsky as Commander. Still others are: the Federation of Russian Combatants, an association of "White" Veterans with headquarters in New York City; the Cossacks Alliance in America, also with headquarters in New York City, and the Orthodox Society of Tikhon, led by Reverend Kedrovsky of Chicago, whose motto is "Orthodoxy and a Single (Indivisible) Russia" and which publishes irregularly Nash Put (Our Road).

The chief activity of these organizations has expressed itself in the last few years in church endeavors, and in efforts to aid Russian families in German-occupied territories and Russian prisoners of the present war. In the pursuit of these aims they have cooperated with the Society for the Relief of Russian War Invalids Outside of Russia; the Tolstoy Foundation and its "Help the Russian Prisoners of War Committee," headed by Countess Alexandra Tolstoy; the Russian Children's Welfare Society; and the Russian Greek

9 DECEMBER 1944

Orthodox Society of St. Vladimir, headed by Archbishop Vitaly of New York. Except for an occasional lecture, these remnants of the Russian monarchists do not engage at present in any conspicuous political activity, their only symbols and outlet for sentiment being the Russian daily *Rossiya* with its recent English addition, the fortnightly *Russia*, which remain unalterably opposed to any compromise with the USSR.*

* See "*Rossiya and the New Publication Russia*," FN Number N-109 of 23 November 1944.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~
This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Act, 50 U.S.C. 31 and 32, as amended. Its transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

C O P Y

82

FOREIGN NATIONALITY GROUPS IN THE UNITED STATES

MEMORANDUM BY THE FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH
TO THE DIRECTOR OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

NUMBER 227

3 JANUARY 1945

THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH IN AMERICA ON THE EVE OF MOSCOW'S ELECTION OF A PATRIARCH

The scheduled election of a new Patriarch in Moscow this month has reawakened interest in the possible reaffiliation of the Russian Orthodox Church in America with the "Mother Church" in Russia. In October a meeting of the Council of Bishops under Metropolitan Theophilos reaffirmed the earlier opposition of these Hierarchs to an organizational reunion with the Patriarchate, and deepened the split between them and Metropolitan Benjamin — official Exarch of the Patriarchate in America. Pressure for reaffiliation continues, however, from some of the lower clergy and laymen; and Benjamin's recent activities — apparently sanctioned by the Patriarchate — point to a strategy of winning over individual parishes from Theophilos' fold. The Patriarchate's latest move has been to invite Theophilos himself to Moscow.

THE Russian-American community has been stirred by the news that the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church has decided to convoke an All-Russian Assembly (*Sobor*) on 31 January 1945, for the purpose of electing a new Patriarch. The announcement from Moscow related that in addition to the thirty-nine bishops who are expected to attend, four orthodox Patriarchs outside of Russia have been invited as guests of honor: the head of the Greek Orthodox Church, Patriarch Benjamin of Constantinople; the Antioch Patriarch, Alexander III; the Alexandria Patriarch, Christopher; and the Jerusalem Patriarch, Timothy.

This announcement raised anew the question as to whether the schism existing in the Russian Orthodox Church in America will be healed and the Church as a whole return to the fold of the "Mother Church" in Russia.* A healing of the breach would bring together

* For an earlier discussion of the problem see FN Number 176 of 8 March 1944, "The Eastern Orthodox Church in the United States."

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 227

— 2 —

3 JANUARY 1945

the 300 or more parishes claimed by the anti-Soviet Metropolitan, Theophilos, and the far smaller number of parishes recognizing the authority of the Moscow Patriarchate's representative in America, Metropolitan Benjamin. A like result, of course, might be attained were Benjamin to succeed in winning over to reaffiliation with the Moscow Patriarchate a majority of Theophilos' parishes. The change would in either case have a profound effect on the attitude of other Orthodox groups in America, particularly Slavs, toward Soviet Russia.

*Meeting of the
Council of Bishops*

The differences between the two factions were intensified several months ago by a decision of the Council of Bishops under Theophilos to remain separate from the Patriarchate. The Council met on 10-11 October in New York City on the occasion of the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of Russian Orthodoxy in America. The nine dioceses adhering to the Council in the United States were represented by Archbishop Tikhon of Seattle and Western America, Archbishop Vitaly of Jersey City and Eastern America, Archbishop Arseny of the Wilkes-Barre-Scranton district, Bishop Alexis of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands, Bishop Leonty of Chicago and Minneapolis, Bishop Benjamin of Pittsburgh and West Virginia, Bishop Ieronim of Detroit and Cleveland, and Bishop Makary of Brooklyn. Bishop Ioasaf of Canada, representing the tenth diocese, was absent due to his failure to obtain a visa. More conspicuous, of course, from the larger viewpoint, were the absences of Metropolitan Benjamin and the Carpatho-Russian Archbishop Adam, both busily engaged at the time in the All-National Liberation Congress of Americans of Russian and Carpatho-Russian Descent, in Philadelphia.*

*The Council's
Decision Against
Reaffiliation*

The Council of Bishops had sent a telegram last May to Acting Patriarch Alexis in Moscow, congratulating him on his accession as *locum tenens* and expressing sympathy on the passing of Patriarch Sergius. Metropolitan Theophilos had also ordered mention of Alexis in regular prayers and services of the Orthodox Church. Nevertheless the Council voted to continue in its present autonomous status, retaining only a spiritual relation with the Church in Russia. This decision was explained by Metropolitan Theophilos in his speech before the Council as follows:

The Russian Church in America always lived, and now lives, in a spirit of unity with the Russian Mother Church, considering itself a part

* See "Carpatho-Russian Liberation Congress," FN Number B-268 of 31 October 1944.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 227

— 3 —

3 JANUARY 1945

of it and its daughter. Although far removed, it remains the only one close to the Mother Church in spirit and teaching. However, it is opposed to the introduction into its life of foreign trends imposed upon the Church in Russia. Such impositions have brought many grave sufferings to the Mother Church, which were also felt by our Church in America. We who represent the American Church are well aware that our Mother Church is suffering even now.

The meeting, according to the Communist-line *Russky Golos*, was "very unquiet." The Bishops, apparently to forestall overheated debates on the subject of affiliation with the "Mother Church," adopted a decision that "in these times which call for responsibility, the clergy and the laity must be especially careful and must not mix in politics, in which they are incompetent."

Apparently sensing that his own position may depend on "delivering the goods," Metropolitan Benjamin — despite a frequently incapacitating stomach ailment from which he is said to suffer — has intensified his efforts in behalf of the Moscow Patriarchate.

Metropolitan Benjamin's Activities Since May Benjamin has visited a number of cities in Michigan, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and other states, delivering lectures and radio talks about the Russian Church and the Soviet Union. He spoke at a conference of the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born in Detroit, at the New School for Social Research in New York, at a reception arranged in his honor by a committee of Boston's Methodist, Episcopal and other clergy together with the Massachusetts Council of American-Soviet Friendship, and in many Russian-American parishes and organizations. Everywhere he presented the same arguments. Before the 1917 Revolution, Russia's Church was corrupt and decaying. It was not its religion but its politics — the Church's hostility to the new regime — that brought on persecutions by the latter. The suffering which the Church underwent cleansed and rejuvenated it so that now "it approaches the perfection of Christianity of apostolic times." Separation of Church and State, and recognition by each of the respective sphere of the other, have progressively led to "sincere and complete friendship" between the two in Russia, a friendship which will continue after the war.

Benjamin not infrequently stressed to Russian audiences that the ideas of world unification through Catholicism and German Protestantism were dead and that "a third idea, the Slavic Orthodox one, is coming to replace them." It was Russia that could bring to the world the unity and mutual respect pre-

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 227

— 4 —

3 JANUARY 1945

vailing among her nationalities, and human rights for the common man. To the Slavs, the USSR could bring "brotherly service." Even the "most difficult" of the Slav peoples — Poland — "must also enter the Slav family for her own good and the good of all Slavdom."

Of more practical import was the Exarch's active campaign to win over parishes from Theophilos' jurisdiction. It has scored no more than a moderate success. By mid-summer 1943, after ten years of effort, Benjamin had only about half a dozen parishes under his authority. He has added since parishes from Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, and Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and a number from Canada. (Archimandrite Anthony Vasiliev was consecrated Bishop of Canada by Benjamin on 29 October.) However at the end of November a telegram from the Moscow Patriarchal Church notified Benjamin of the acceptance of Archbishop Adam into its fold. The Archbishop controls at least twenty, and by some accounts sixty, Carpatho-Russian Orthodox parishes in the United States and Canada.

*Archbishop
Adam*

Born in Galicia and now over sixty years of age, Adam Philipovski was at one time a member of the law faculty of the University of Lwow. Some years before the last World War he came to North America and became first a priest and then a monk, rising to the rank of Archimandrite. At the end of World War I, when the possibility of an autonomous Carpatho-Russia was contemplated, he was designated bishop of the Carpatho-Russian people. His refusal to liquidate the Carpatho-Russian bishopric when Carpatho-Russia was incorporated into Czechoslovakia led to his separation from the Russian Orthodox Church in America and to quarrels with Theophilos' predecessor, Metropolitan Platon (1924-1934), with whom he was reconciled just before the latter's death. In 1934, at the Cleveland *Sobor*, Adam became reunited to the North American Metropolitan district, headed by Theophilos, and was elevated to the rank of Archbishop — only to break away again at the *Sobor* in New York, three years later. Having taken most of his parishes in the United States and Canada with him, Adam entered into some kind of agreement with Exarch Benjamin. But as a result of a quarrel with the latter, duly reported to Moscow, he was stripped of his rank by the Patriarchate and reduced to the status of a simple layman. Refusing to abide by the decision he continued on his own until November 1944 when the Patriarchate restored him to his rank. Adam's reunion with the Patriarchate was due largely to Benjamin's intervention in his behalf.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 227

— 5 —

3 JANUARY 1945

*Benjamin's
Four Hierarchs*

The elevation of ordinary clergymen to higher status, especially the rank of Bishop, is evidently proving an effective tool in the expansion of Benjamin's influence. Together with Feodor, of St. George's Church in Chicago, who was consecrated by Benjamin as Bishop of the Argentine on 12 December 1943, but was never permitted to enter that country, the Benjamin group now counts four Hierarchs: Benjamin himself, Archbishop Adam, Bishop Feodor, and Bishop Anthony. The coming election of a Patriarch is apparently regarded by Benjamin as opening new possibilities, and he has applied for a re-entry permit as well as for air travel priority at the State Department for the hop to Moscow. The visit would obviously give him added prestige among the Orthodox clergy in the Americas.

*Theophilos'
Counter-Activities*

Metropolitan Theophilos and his aides appear to be perfectly aware of the growing threat to their hold on the Orthodox believers in America. The relations between these Hierarchs and Metropolitan Benjamin have consequently grown worse in the past year, and rumors to the effect that Metropolitan Benjamin and Bishop Feodor had been poisoned — which created quite a sensation in the Russian community at the end of August — were inferentially blamed by Benjamin on his opponents, "the enemies of the Moscow Patriarchal Church who are prematurely trying to bury me" (*Novaya Zarya*, 2 September).

Despite the burden of his age, the seventy-year old Theophilos undertook to meet the threat in a series of trips in connection with the celebrations of the 150th anniversary of the Orthodox Church, 7 October-31 December. He visited Canada, Chicago, Cleveland and various communities in Connecticut, New York and California, personally conducting services and meeting with the pastors and parishioners. At his request the Council of Bishops in America voted to assume temporarily the right of issuing highest awards to the clergy — a right heretofore exercised by the Council of Hierarchs of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, the so-called Karlovac Synod, which had its seat in Sremski Karlovac, Serbia.

A number of awards were made at the 11 October session, as well as by Theophilos himself in the course of his trips. The Metropolitan also sought to reassure the lower clergy by sponsoring a number of encouraging articles for a two-volume jubilee book, now being issued in commemoration of the anniver-

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 227

— 6 —

3 JANUARY 1945

sary. Similar activities were carried out by his aides in many Russian communities in the past few months.

According to an item in *Novoye Russkoye Slovo* (8 December) there was even a project afoot to raise Archpriest Peter Kohanic of Passaic, New Jersey, to the rank of Bishop and appoint him to the Carpatho-Russian chair in the Seminary, once held by Archbishop Adam. However, in line with Metropolitan Theophilos' known objection to any break-up of the Orthodox Church into nationality divisions, Kohanic declared a week later that he "would never agree to a Carpatho-Russian bishopric"; all Carpatho-Russians, he said, have since 1891 been within the jurisdiction of the Russian Orthodox Metropoly, and "Carpatho-Russians, therefore, have no need at all of a special bishop."

*Rossiia Supports
Theophilos*

His quiet campaign for definitive autonomy of the Church in America not having made much headway because of the revived loyalty to Russia,* Theophilos' efforts are currently directed towards maintaining "provisional" autonomy for the present. In this he finds his chief support in the Czarist daily *Rossiia*. *Rossiia's* position was most recently stated in an article reprinting a speech of Archpriest Alexander Kukulevsky (9 December), and in an editorial by Nikolai Rybakoff, the paper's editor. There was danger in particularizing the Church into Great-Russian, Little-Russian [Ukrainian], and Carpatho-Russian branches, warned Kukulevsky. The idea of a Single Orthodox Church, like the idea of a Single Russia, must prevail. Sympathy for the Red Army as the defender of Russia must not be transferred to sympathy for Red symbols, the Red flag and Red institutions. Those, he said, who advocated immediate submission to the Patriarch and those who insisted on permanent autonomy or outocephaly were alike wrong.

Kukulevsky went on to say that in these transitional times the wisest road was the one of provisional autonomy chosen by Metropolitan Theophilos, that after all "there is no Russia as a Power" but only sixteen republics and only the future would define the relation of the Orthodox inhabitants of these republics to the Patriarch in Moscow. The thing to do therefore was to await a free *Sobor* in the future in which the American Church would participate. In the meantime, he concluded, "it would be desirable that members of our churches and

* See also, "Russian Nationalism Realigns the Anti-Bolshevik Russians," FN Number 211 of 13 September 1944.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 227

— 7 —

3 JANUARY 1945

especially the religious fathers should not sow confusion in the minds of the people through newspaper discussions on these themes, which only obscure the issue."

A similar line was taken by Rybakoff who argued that the Orthodox Church in Russia was in the "terrible captivity" of the Soviets, that all recent religious concessions were only for external consumption, and that the participants of the coming *Sobor* in Moscow had been hand-picked by Stalin. As proof he adduced the fact that neither Metropolitan Theophilos nor the leader of the Russian Church outside of Russia, Metropolitan Anastasy, had been invited to the *Sobor*. "Let us await, therefore," he concluded, "a canonically legal, free and full convocation of the Russian Church *Sobor* in Moscow."

Pressure for Reaffiliation Pressure for reunion with the Moscow Patriarchate is proceeding, however, from several directions. While the attitude of the Living Church group is negative at present (at the funeral services for its leader, Archbishop Nicolai Kedrov, on 19 May, speeches were made by its clergymen attacking both the Theophilos and Benjamin forces), at least one of the Theophilos Hierarchs, Bishop Makary, and apparently a considerable part of the lower clergy and laymen, are for an early affiliation.

Some of the latter presented petitions at the Council of Bishops sessions on 10-11 October asking the hastening of the convocation of the Seventh All-American Church *Sobor* — which would include representatives of the Church communities — to resolve the issue once and for all. The Council reaffirmed its stand of June 1942 that such a meeting would have to await the end of the war, when many of the active Church members now in the service would return. The demand was then made that the Council of Bishops should admit to its sessions the Metropolitan Council, which consists of both priests and lay members, so that the joint assembly might take a decision in the matter. This demand was likewise turned down on the ground that in accordance with a 1936 decision the voice of the Metropolitan Council is limited to economic and financial questions — matters of faith, ethics, canons and administration belonging to the exclusive authority of the Council of Bishops. The Council emphasized its determination to stand pat by permanently expelling from the Church all the clergymen who have gone over to the Patriarchal jurisdiction and forbidding all intercourse with them.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 227

— 8 —

3 JANUARY 1945

*Chepelev's
Articles*

The protesting clergymen seemed to have found a spokesman when last May Archpriest I. Chepelev of Detroit argued in the San Francisco *Novaya Zarya* that structurally and canonically the American Orthodox Church cannot become autocephalous, and that there was no historical church precedent for autonomy. Inquiring whether there were not "some other considerations" than Church ones for the continuing "separation from the Mother Church," Chepelev nevertheless placed "entire hope" in Metropolitan Theophilos for a proper policy.

But that was before the meeting of the Bishops. In a more recent article (*Novoye Russkoye Slovo*, 29 November) Chepelev accused the American Orthodox Hierarchs of sowing division and estrangement from the Church of Russia in the past twenty-five years. Berdyaev's prediction of a true and "creative" religious revival in Russia, said Chepelev, was now "taking place before our very eyes." The Hierarchs, he concluded, were trying to arrogate to themselves the exclusive right to play politics, but the mass of the clergy, who unlike their superiors had enthusiastically responded to the patriotic call of the "Mother Church," would no more heed the politics prohibition than they had an effort at censorship attempted several years earlier.

*Russky Golos
Chimes In*

Reaffiliationist laymen and clergymen, some of whom take their stand from denominational and Russian-nationalist rather than pro-Soviet motives, find themselves in the peculiar position of being upheld and applauded by once-atheist Communists and fellow-travelers, who are said to have been instructed to attend religious services and actively participate in Church work. For months the Communist-line *Russky Golos* led all other Russian-language papers in reporting such items as the establishment of new churches and a religious seminary in Russia, friendly exchanges between the Church and the Soviet Government, and the opening of an Orthodox church in the Soviet Embassy building in Istanbul. The paper also publicized the claim of the Holy Synod of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church that it had begged the former Bulgarian government "to stretch a brotherly hand to the Russian people." More direct support for the Reaffiliationists was given by *Russky Golos* in editorials which criticized *Rossiia's* stand and accused the "Theophilosites" of refusing to participate relief for Russia on the ground of "politics," while at the same time taking part in the Dewey campaign.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 227

— 9 —

3 JANUARY 1945

*Strategy of the
Reaffiliationists*

The strategy of the Reaffiliationist leadership was revealed by Archbishop Adam to a friend of this Branch. It appears to be based on the expectation of a revolt from below. The lower clergy in the Theophilos camp are to be weaned from their recalcitrant leaders and the latter isolated, should they continue in their present stand. Adam emphasized that the position of these lower-rank clergymen, "who favor the reestablishment of organizational relationships with Moscow but are afraid to take an open stand," will improve when the Church communities press their demands. The laymen, he continued, are largely for the recognition of the Patriarch — "and their voice will soon become noticeable." The result, Adam predicted, will be "a gradual drift of the parishes to the Patriarch's side." Adam himself, it appears, intends to use his new position by the side of Benjamin toward that end, and will retain for the time being his title of Carpatho-Russian Archbishop because it appeals to large sections of Orthodox parishioners hailing from Carpatho-Russia and the Galician Lemko territory.

*Moscow's
Latest Stroke*

The Moscow Patriarchate itself, which was earlier expected to take a hand in the matter by sending a delegate to America some time after the election of the new Patriarch, in December executed a bold stroke. Through Metropolitan Benjamin it issued an invitation to Metropolitan Theophilos (reported in all the Russian dailies during the week of 20-27 December) to come to the *Sobor* in Moscow with delegates from the Russian Orthodox Church in America. Benjamin's telegram read in part:

In the name of Saint Nicholas I implore you fraternally to listen to the voice of the Mother-Church and complete the union of the daughter with her. Do me an honor: answer telegraphically to Brooklyn

Theophilos, who is reported recently to have expressed to his confidants a desire to send to Moscow an "observer" who would convey his attitude to the Patriarchate without the distorting representations of Benjamin as intermediary, found himself on the horns of a dilemma: whatever decision he adopted would be turned to the advantage of the Reaffiliationists. He did not answer Benjamin, but sent a telegram of thanks for the invitation directly to Moscow,

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

~~SECRET~~

NUMBER 227

— 10 —

3 JANUARY 1945

and met with Archbishop Tikhon to arrive at a proper course of action. Air mail inquiries were also made of the other bishops. According to latest reports a delegation composed of the Reverend Nicholas Metropolsky of Stratford, Connecticut, Ralph Montgomery Arkush, a New York lawyer, and Bishop Alexis will be sent to Moscow. The three would represent the Hierarchs, clergy, and laity of the Theophilus churches. While the precise nature of the delegates' mandate is not known, this Branch has learned that they would insist on a degree of self-government for the Russian Orthodox Church in America.

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES

FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

PRINTED IN
REPRODUCTION BRANCH, OSS

KCH:WMJ

SAC, New York

January 20, 1945

John Edgar Hoover - Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation

FUNDS FOR THE RELIEF OF MEN OF LETTERS AND
SCIENTISTS OF RUSSIA, aka "The Literary Fund."
INTERNAL SECURITY - R.

For your information with regard to the captioned organization, there are attached copies of a memorandum issued under date of December 16, 1944, by the Foreign Nationalities Branch of the Office of Strategic Services entitled, "The Russian 'Literary Fund' Intensifies Its Relief Activities on Behalf of Russian Intellectuals Outside the USSR."

Any utilization of material from the attached should be such as to protect the Office of Strategic Services as its immediate source.

Enclosure

16 December 1944

THE RUSSIAN "LITERARY FUND"
INTENSIFIES ITS RELIEF ACTIVITIES ON BEHALF
OF RUSSIAN INTELLECTUALS OUTSIDE THE USSR

AT A banquet Thanksgiving Day eve presided over by Alexander Kerensky, head of the Provisional Government of Russia in 1917, members and friends of Funds for the Relief of Men of Letters and Scientists of Russia more popularly known among Russian-Americans as "The Literary Fund") agreed to send immediate aid to needy Russian writers and scientists in the liberated parts of Europe, particularly France. The banquet was arranged as a fund-raising affair in response to an appeal for financial assistance from a London Committee recently organized to aid Russian intellectuals in France. A personal message from Dr. N. S. Dolgopolov, a prominent Russian long active among the Russian emigration in Paris, to Alexander Konovalov, a member of the Fund's board, accompanied the appeal and was published in the liberal New York daily Novoye Russkoye Slovo of 17 November.

At the banquet, Professor Michael Karpovich of Harvard University recalled that this year marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Fund, and that since its inception, \$75,000 had been collected and distributed among Russian intellectuals. Although the Russian emigration was inclined to minimize its own role, Professor Karpovich said, its success could be attested by the fact that 100 Russian professors were teaching in American universities and Russian writers and scientists had contributed to the cultures of all the lands of their residence. In appealing for contributions Karpovich asked the 200 or more guests present "not to let the candle go out for the aged and ailing creative men of Russia abroad." A similar appeal was made by Andrey Sedykh, who is known for his intimate knowledge of the Russian colony in France. Sedykh is at present a writer for the Novoye Russkoye Slovo. Fifteen hundred dollars in cash was collected and more funds are expected from pledges. In April the Fund had a balance of over \$3,000. Although earlier in the year the possibility of sending packages into Soviet Russia was under consideration, nothing apparently has come of the project.

The "Literary Fund" includes among its officers and board members some of the most prominent Russian-American intellectuals of the Center and non-Bolshevik Left: Boris Nikolaevsky, Mark Aldanov, Michael Karpovich, E. P. Poluskin, N. S. Timashev, Vera Aleksandrova, N. S. Kalashnikoff, Andrey Sedykh, Mark Weinbaum, V. Zenzinov, and Michael Zetlin.

This Fund is not to be confused with the Russian Student Fund, established in 1921 as a revolving Loan Scholarship Fund to assist young men and women of Russian origin whose university education had been interrupted by the First World War and who had found their way to the United States. The Russian Student Fund has assisted over 600 students in more than 100 institutions to the extent of \$650,000 in loans, of which over \$275,000 has been repaid. Dr. Stephen Duggan is chairman of the board of directors, which is composed of a number of prominent Americans.

COPY

SAC, Seattle

November 22, 1944

John Edgar Hoover, Director - Federal Bureau of Investigation

WHITE RUSSIAN ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES;
INTERNAL SECURITY - WR

Attached hereto are copies of a memorandum issued by the Foreign Nationalities Branch of the Office of Strategic Services under date of November 1, 1944. You will note this concerns a booklet published under the auspices of the Association of Officers and Men Formerly of the Russian Army. The content of this booklet evidently reflects an increasing pro-Russian if not an actual pro-Communist tendency within the recent past on the part of various formerly radically anti-Soviet White Russian groups.

A general tendency amongst various nationalist groups of different nationalities in this country has been noted and I should like to emphasize the fact that data reflecting on this matter is of considerable importance currently to the Bureau from an intelligence standpoint and should be accordingly made available to the Seat of Government promptly as it comes to your attention.

Any utilization of material from the attachment hereto should be such as to protect the Office of Strategic Services as its immediate source.

Enclosures

COPY

O S S

~~RESTRICTED~~

F N B

NEWS NOTES

OFFICE OF STRATEGIC SERVICES
FOREIGN NATIONALITIES BRANCH

The following current news is circulated at once by reason of its timeliness. In conjunction with other and later intelligence the material may be used again in the longer-range studies of this Branch.

X Press Item

Account of Oral Interview

Confidential Report

Number N 87

1 November 1944

THE WESTERN FRONTIER OF RUSSIA

A Historical Justification of Russian Territorial
Claims Written by Russian Emigres Gathered
in the Association of Officers and Men

THE melting away of animosity for the present Soviet regime on the part of Russian emigres in this country is again demonstrated in a booklet, The Western Frontier of Russia, published under the auspices of the Association of Officers and Men Formerly of the Russian Army, by the Willard Publishing Company of New York City. The pamphlet presents a historical justification for the territorial adjustments currently being demanded by the Soviet Union. An editorial board consisting of J. Bromberg, P. Konvaloff, N. Mandrovsky, and V. Vassilieff. disclaims in the foreword any sympathy with the ideas of Communism but expresses its belief that the territorial demands "of the present government of Russia do not transgress the minimum without which..... her /Russia's/ very national existence would be endangered." The four articles which comprise the booklet proceed from the author's general thesis that "By all her history Russia seems to have been prepared to play a dominant role in Eastern Europe." The chapters are titled "Russia and Finland," "The Baltic Provinces," "The Soviet Polish Borders," and "The Bessarabian Question."

Russian
NA

DIRECTOR - Federal Bureau of Investigation

January 26, 1945

WIT HOTEL, SAC - Washington, D. C.

SUBJ: WASHINGTON, D. C.
INTERNAL SECURITY - R

FOIA(b) (7) - (D)

On January 13, 1945, [redacted]

[redacted] furnished to Special Agent CHARLES E. DAVIS of this office a copy of a report dated January 8, 1945, written in French, concerning Russian activities in this country.

[redacted] prepared this report upon the basis of information furnished him by [redacted]

[redacted] said that his informant possesses an amazing quantity of information concerning Russians and Communists in this country, especially in the vicinity of New York City.

When it was pointed out to [redacted] that his informant might prove of great value to the FBI if he were brought in contact with the New York Field Division, [redacted] expressed the opinion that his informant would be extremely reticent if contacted by the FBI in view of his character and general nature and that at least for the time being he thought it best that his informant be contacted only by himself. [redacted] promised, however, to furnish any information concerning organizations or persons residing in this country which were reported to him by his informant, to this office. [redacted] previously furnished information to this office as reported to him by the same informant concerning LOUIS POUVET and other alleged Communists in New York City.

There are being transmitted herewith to the Bureau two copies, and one copy to the New York and San Francisco Field Divisions of a translation of [redacted] report. In the event more specific information is desired about any phase of this report, it is suggested that the Bureau or the interested offices advise this office accordingly.

The above information is being submitted for the advice of the Bureau and the interested offices.

Enclosure
JED:RG
100-16597

cc - New York Enclosure
San Francisco "
Washington Field Office File #100-4188

Rec
4/16/45
JED

January 8, 1945.

January 4, 1945)
ODN) written in-
B2) ink.

SECRET

RUSSIAN CIRCLES IN THE U.S.A.

I - DECLARATIONS OF A GENERAL NATURE:

In 1943, the official American statistics listed 1,040,889 individuals as "foreign born whites", born in Russia; the principal groups were located in the following States :

New York State	436,028
Pennsylvania	95,803
Illinois	74,454
Massachusetts	64,575
New Jersey	55,407
California	51,758

In fact, these "foreign born whites" do not constitute the "Russian colony" because many of them coming to the United States as children are completely Americanized and have even forgotten their native language.

In 1940, it was estimated that only 600,000 had maintained Russian as their habitual language.

It must be acknowledged that the majority of Russian emigrants are Jews, whose native language is "Yiddish" - The use of this language and the predominance of their Jewish nature on the Russians, have caused many of them to lose the elements of their original nationality.

Only the dangers prevailing in Russia at the time of the Hitler invasion could recall to mind of a certain few their native land.

The two centers of immigration and consequently the centers of political life within the Russian colony are within the States of New York and California, which serve as issuing points of immigration, one coming from Europe via the Atlantic, the other from Siberia via China and the Pacific.

II - THE RUSSIAN PRESS APPEARING IN THE U.S.A.

There are actually 5 Russian Dailies appearing in the U.S.A., with a probable global drawing of 70,000 copies.

Three among those are published in New York, the other two in San Francisco.

The following appear in New York :

a) "ROSSIYA" (Russia) - very small circulation - This daily, previous to PEARL HARBOR, had demonstrated pro-German and pro-Japanese tendencies. Today, they stress their American patriotism, but remain defeatist concerning Russia.

This attitude is severely judged by the majority of Russians and because of this the influence of the "ROSSIYA" is absolutely negligible.

b) "NOVOYE RUSSKOYE SLEVO" (New Russian world) - Not connected with any political party - Represents democratic opinions, also anti-Communist, but seem to align themselves with Soviets more and more.

At the beginning only manifested sentiments of loyalty to U.S.A. and Russia, but progressively abandoned its criticisms of the Soviet regime for support of the most Chauvinistic aspirations of U.S.S.R.

In that respect it only indulged in the evolution generally ascertained in the most anti-Soviet Russian circles.

MARK WEINBAUM is its Editor-in-Chief, American citizen, judged as a mediocre writer and of average intelligence.

c) "RUSSKII COLOS" (the Russian voice) presents itself as an organ which is not affiliated with any one party, but has definite Communist tendencies, carefully following the course of the party in all its variations.

The Editor-in-Chief is a certain one, named, KRINKIN who seems but a cover.

The most important personage on his editorial Board is SERGE KOURNAKOV, former Captain in the WRANGEL army, 100% supporter of the ideas of the Communist party.

KOURNAKOV poses as an expert regarding military questions in all of the Communist Press; notably, he wrote in the DAILY WORKER under the pseudonyme of "VETERAN COMMANDER" and received his instructions from Moscow.

In San Francisco :

a) "RUSSKAYA ZHIZN" ("Russian Life") - considered as a democratic organ and of moderate tendencies.

b) "NOVAYA ZARYA" (New Dawn) directed by ALEXANDER KAZEM-BEK.

KAZEM-BEK who lived in France sometime in 1940 is the founder and principal leader of the "MLADOROSS" movement (Russian youth) which was under surveillance by our police in France in 1939-1940.

It is an odd movement and although it has monarchists tendencies yet it admires the Soviet regime without reserve.

For a time there existed within this movement, partisans in favor of re-establishing the Russian pretender to the throne of Russia and at the same time retaining Stalin as the Head of the Government.

This movement was closely connected with the Grand Duke CYRILLE, known to emigration as the legitimate Emperor and after the death of the latter, with his son VLADIMIR.

The "MLADOROSS" were connected with the Italian Fascist and KAZEM-BEK was even received by Mussolini.

Likewise they were connected with the German nationalist-socialist, but through the intermediary of Soviet agents.

Extremely patriotic, they profess a limitless admiration for the Red Army and for a while their slogan was "Complete Power to the Red Army!"

In the spring of 1940, most of the members of the Movement at Paris were arrested under suspicion of military espionage, but this affair following defeat, could not be clarified.

After the defeat LAVAL released the "MLADOROSS".

Today, without changing their line of conduct, they remain Russian super-nationalists.

III - THE "YIDDISH" PRESS IN THE U.S.A.

In 1940 one calculated 1751.100 individuals registered as claiming "YIDDISH" as their native language.

They constitute the contingent of readers of the Jewish Press, published in "YIDDISH" and a number of them are Russians.

In New York are published four Jewish Dailies :

a) the "FORWARD" is the most important with a circulation of more than 100,000 copies and a special edition in Chicago.

100% democratic organ, of moderate socialist tendencies, but definitely anti-Communist.

It has done a great deal to elevate the cultural level of the Jewish masses in New York.

The majority of its collaborators are of Russian origin, speaking Russian and very well versed on the Russian problems - Certain Russian political men, even those who are non-Jews take active part and the articles in the Russian language are translated into "YIDDISH".

The "FORWARD" is the object of violent attacks by Communists, including the DAILY WORKER - which leads us to suppose that they consider it as a very influential publication.

To the Communists it represents the most anti-Communist paper in the U.S.A.

Yet, since the German aggression against Russia, the FORWARD acknowledging the patriotic sentiments of its readers, became very prudent in its criticisms of the Soviet regime.

b) "FREIHEIT" (Liberty) is a paper with a definite Communist tendency.

c) "DER TAC" (DAY) is a daily without very decided political bearings.

d) A fourth daily, entitled YIDDISH of which we were unable to secure a translation, is an organ without any political tendencies, but rather a purely informative paper for the Jewish bourgeoisie.

NOTE : - An observation of a general nature is given :

By its heroic struggle against Hitlerian Germany, Russia has become very popular in the Jewish circles of the U.S.A.

The war against Germany represents for them, first of all, the war against anti-Semitism.

The majority of the Jews are persuaded that Russia is not anti-Semitic, and consequently Soviet propaganda very cleverly exploits this sentiment.

IV - POLITICAL DIVISION OF THE RUSSIAN EMIGRANTS IN THE U.S.A.

Only a few thousand among the emigrants participate in political activity.

First of all, one must note a very specific evolution in the sentiments of these.

The Russian emigrants who left Russia in 1917, left there as victims and as rabid enemies of the Soviet regime. A number of them participated in the civil war in the ranks of the "counter-revolution" for a complete restoration of the Czarism.

But they never ceased to be irreconcilable nationalists and that is the reason today why so many of them greatly admire the work done by STALIN and all the new grandeur that it holds for Russia.

Not only do they ardently seek Russian victory and show enthusiasm at each success of the Red Army, but consider that the Soviet power has ceased to be Communistic in order to become a perfect embodiment of Russian nationalism.

Those who previously said that Russia was governed by a band of criminals no longer tolerate a single criticism against STALIN and his regime.

One can uncover two major causes in this evolution:

On one hand, the action of a remarkably articulated official propaganda which points out and probably exaggerates the traits of nationalism in the Soviet policy, with such facts as the dissolution of the KOMINTERN or the reconciliation with the church, and on the other hand, a form of nostalgia, increased when the emigrants discovered at the time of the Russian resistance, the reincarnation of the "HOLY AND ETERNAL RUSSIA".

Yesterday, they considered STALIN as the greatest criminal in history; today, they consider him as the most genuine type of national character.

Thus was established surroundings, particularly favorable to the Soviet propaganda.

For them
/It is not a question of converting monarchists nor to organize emigrants rallied to the regime in sections nor to recognize them as Soviet citizens.

On the contrary, it is infinitely more important to utilize Russian sentiments and means, not suspected of Soviet affiliation, in order to influence American opinion.

The Americans are extremely impressed to see the victims of the regime become its admirers; they discovered a tangible proof in the merits of the regime and its evolutions towards reason, the return

to traditions and moderation.

Comparatively to this line of conduct, the task of the Soviet Agents in the U.S.A. is to discredit all those who did not rally ^{and} could influence the Americans unfavorably.

Disparaging campaigns, under the inculcation of Fascism or Hitlerism are launched against certain ones within emigrant circles.

Thus it is that the democratic and anti-Stalin groups, although no less patriotic than others, and also anti-Hitler, are subject to an increasing pressure.

These groups, in fact, are not numerous and now very detached.

The most important ones are :

a) The group of Socialists-Democrats of "MECHEVIKS" whose "club" comprises from 190 to 200 members, publishes a monthly review, the "SOCIALIST COURIER".

The President is RAPHAEL ABRAMOVITCH-REIN, whose son MARC REIN was kidnaped and assassinated in 1937 by the Communists in Spain.

The circulation of the "SOCIALIST COURIER" does not exceed 560 copies, but in spite of that it is entering into its 24th year.

From 1921 to 1933 it was published in Berlin;

From 1933 to 1940 at Paris;

From the fall of 1940 up to the present day, it appears in New York.

This press underwent numerous difficulties and even a division among its members. Certain ones left at Paris and in New York established their own monthly "THE NEW ROAD", directed by THEODORE DAN who, before the division, was President of the "MECHEVIKS" group.

This fraction declare themselves "socialist in reality revolutionary" of the Leftist.

Although expressing certain reserves with regard to the Soviet regime, an American author wrote about them in 1943 :

"The New Road unreservedly supports the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and is quite cautious in its criticism of the

internal actions of the Soviet Government."

Today the group of DAN practically defends all that is done by the Soviet Government and cheers the Russian conquests in Europe as a means to an end of the European social revolution.

One of the most influential members of the group is ALEXANDER SCHIFFRINE, who endorses the Communists ideas 100%; but it would seem more opportune, as much for himself as for Soviet propaganda, if he figured as a non Communist writer.

Although without any military authorization he became a rather popular ^{military} commentator, using the pseudonyme of "MAX WERNER". It appears that he receives his instructions from the Soviet Embassy.

At Paris in 1937, he was suspected as a Soviet agent.

In Russia, he is cited and considered as a well known American writer.

b) Closely connected with this group and yet less numerous are those of the socialists (Revolutionary) directed by Victor TCHERNOFF and ZENSINOFF.

They also have a small review "POUR LA LIBERTE" (FOR LIBERTY) which rarely appears, perhaps once or twice a year.

One of them assumed an entirely different attitude : he is ALEXANDER KERENSKY who, in 1917 was Head of the Provisional Government which was overthrown by the Bolsheviki.

Although anti-Communist, KERENSKY is a profound patriot and imperialist.

He publicly supports STALIN's foreign policy and yet remains a partisan of Democracy, adversary to dictatorship and criticizing the Soviet regime.

One finds within the Socialists-Revolutionary groups a fraction of a few members, extremely pro-Soviets who are suspected as Soviet agents.

One of them, SOUKHOMLINE wrote in the paper FRANCE AMERIQUE, using the pseudonyme of VICTOR SAMARET.

SOUKHOMLINE, prior to hostilities, lived in Prague where he edited in French the review "L'EUROPE CENTRALE" (CENTRAL EUROPE); anti-Soviet at that time, he was finally rallied to the regime during his stay in this city.

Going to Paris each year since 1937 he was considered at that time as a Soviet-Czech propagandist.

Established at Paris after Munich, he transferred there "L'EUROPE CENTRALE" (CENTRAL EUROPE) which was supported by the Czech Government.

Although violently anti-German he was allowed to stay in the occupied zone for some time after the defeat - certain Russian emigrants consider this as a manifestation of Soviet protection.

Upon his arrival in New York in 1941, SOUKHOMLINE resumed his connections with the Czechs.

He is severely criticized by the anti-Stalin emigrants who consider him as setting forth slanderous campaigns with regard to them.

He collaborates with "NOVOSELYE" (la nouvelle maison) (NEW ABODE) published by Mme. Sophie PREYHEL sister of a Russian business man, naturalized French.

This review at the beginning was solely literary but little by little changed to ideas which were definitely pro-Soviet.

The MENCHEVIKS, like all the Socialist-Revolutionaries, maintain friendly relations with the "AMERICAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION" which has a section in the Russian language, but has but one limited action.

Connected at the beginning with the AMERICAN LABOR PARTY, it broke relations with them, in order to join the LIBERAL PARTY founded by the anti-Communist minority of the A.L.P. after the conquest of the latter by the Communists.

The Jewish elements of the democratic emigration as well as the anti-Communists are linked with the JEWISH LABOR COMMITTEE.

c) Closely connected to these two groups by a common ideology, although not affiliated with it and not belonging to any party, a cer-

tain number of Russian intellectuals united, in order to publish a voluminous review, appearing 3 or 4 times each year : "The New Review, Russian Quarterly" which is the organ of the democratic Russian thought.

This paper is directed by Marc ALDRAW, author of historical novels, Michael KARPOVITCH, for 17 years Professor of History at Harvard University and Michel ZEITLIN, author of Etudes on Russian music.

The circulation of this review is 1,200 copies.

d) The RUSSIAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE is definitely a Soviet organization, but it is an official organism which does not deal with the problem of emigrants.

e) The RUSSIAN ECONOMIC INSTITUTE, which includes certain emigrants and learned Americans, was founded by a certain one M. NORMANS, whose real name is LEVIN, naturalized Brazilian after he left Berlin where he had some difficulty in escaping the police for matters of a criminal nature.

Certain emigrants consider this Institute as an instrument of pro-Soviet propaganda.

f) In orthodox church circles in the U.S.A., divisions likewise exist between the emigrant clergy and the new Metropolitan BENJAMIN, sent to the U.S.A. by Moscow. But this is deserving of special study which this Post has not as yet been able to accomplish.

g) Finally, to mention a monthly publication in English, "RUSSIAN AFFAIRS", edited by democratic Russian emigrants who, in the 1st number of their review, in October 1941, also outlined their goal : "Knowledge and sympathy for the Russian people and their evolution does not implicate acceptance without reserve for the totalitarian form of the present Russian State".

This review was only of short duration.

In December 1944, the Soviet Embassy requested the State Department for the suppression of same.

Its leaders believe that due to this fact, it will not appear after this month's publication.

TR:JL